PROPHECY IN THE WRITINGS OF PAUL

Mary Faith Carson

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE

FACULTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE BY THE

DEPARTMENT OF

RELIGION

August, 1967

PREFACE

It is surprising that the concept of prophecy which is so significant in the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature as well as the New Testament has received little attention from New Testament scholars. It is even more surprising that no major work on the understanding of prophecy in the writings of Paul, who was steeped in the Old Testament and Rabbinic Literature and played a crucial role in primitive Christianity, has appeared. The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate what the function of prophecy is in the thinking of Paul and to ascertain what, for him, was the particular contribution made by the prophet to the early church.

It is to be understood in this study that the Pauline corpus includes: Romans, I & II Corinthians, Galatians, I & II Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon. Scholars have differed greatly concerning the authorship of all the letters, but there is general agreement that these are written by Paul.[1] The genuineness of Colossians and Ephesians has been more widely contested. From the standpoint of language, style, and content there is more reason to assume the authenticity of Colossians

---

[1]Cf. Paul Feine and Johannes Behm, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr. (14th ed., rev. & ed. Werner Georg Kümmel; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 177-272 for an excellent summary of viewpoints concerning the authenticity of each letter.

than Ephesians.[1] In any case, no argument is included which depends on Colossians alone for substantiation. A consideration of the language, style, and the historical and congregational situation which they presuppose clearly points to the pseudonymity of the Pastorals.[2]

Except in the cases where I have provided my own translation for words and phrases of particular significance for this study, the translation used is the Revised Standard Version.[3]

I should like to express gratitude to my advisor, Professor Franklin W. Young, for his helpful suggestions in the preparation of this dissertation and to my landlady, Mrs. Xaver von Erdberg, for supplying good food and pleasant surroundings, a great help in these years of study.

---

[1]Cf. C. L. Mitton, The Epistle of Ephesians (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951, for a thorough treatment of the authorship of Ephesians.

[2]Cf. Feine, Behm, Kümmel, op. cit., pp. 260-272; Johan C. Beker, "The Pastoral Letters," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. Geo. A. Buttrick, III (1962), 668-675.

[3]Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE i

CHAPTER:

I. PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE 1

II. PROPHECY AND THE LAW. 27

III. THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. 72

IV. PAUL AS A PROPHET 125

V. PROPHECY AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE 175

CONCLUSION. 243

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 256

ABSTRACT. 271

CHAPTER I

PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE

The Problem

A study of the New Testament reveals that prophecy was a vigorous force in the early Christian community. The spirit of prophecy, which had been so powerful and so characteristic of the Hebrew community as it developed during the Old Testament period,[1] apparently died out during the intertestamental period, but the hope for its return remained very much alive in the hearts of devout Jews. The beginning of Christianity brought an "outburst of spiritual energy,"[2] and with it, a revival of prophecy. E. K. Mitchell says: "The opening of the Christian era was signalized by a remarkable awakening of the spirit of prophecy. . . ."[3]

---

[1]Harold A. Guy, New Testament Prophecy, Its Origin and Significance (London: The Epworth Press, 1947), p. 1.

[2]Shirley Jackson Case, The Evolution of Early Christianity (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914), p. 2.

[3]E. K. Mitchell, "Prophecy," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, X (1921), 382.

Although scholars have generally recognized the significance of prophecy in the early Christian movement, very little work has been done on the nature and function of the New Testament prophet. This study will focus attention on the prophet and prophecy in the writings of Paul.

The Significance of the Problem

Although the New Testament prophet and prophecy have not received the attention which Biblical scholars have paid the Old Testament prophets, it cannot be denied that they played a very important role in the early church. The New Testament prophet could not be included in Napier's statement about Old Testament prophets: "With some justification the person of the prophet and his function in the history of Israel have been accorded a role of unparalleled significance in the literature and tradition both of Judaism and of Christianity."[1] The New Testament prophet simply has not been "accorded unparalleled significance" in Christian literature. Moreover, they are rarely discussed among scholars because they conjure up visions of enthusiasts and sect groups or of persons supernaturally gifted with fantastic predictive powers. However, the New Testament itself witnesses to the significance of the prophet and prophecy in the early church.

---

[1] B. D. Napier, "Prophet, Prophetism," Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible, ed. G. A. Buttrick, III (1962), 896.

In the opening chapters of Luke the coming of Jesus was attested by Zechariah, a priest (1:5) who was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied (1:67); by Simeon who was inspired by the Holy Spirit (2:25-32); and by the prophetess, Anna (2:36). According to the Synoptics, John the Baptist was known as a prophet. In Luke Zechariah predicts his coming with: "And you, child, will be called the prophet of the Most High" (1:76). He was widely held to be a prophet (Mk. 11:32; Mt. 14:5; 21:26; Lk. 20:6); some even saw in him Elijah reappeared (Mk. 6:15; Lk. 9:8). Jesus referred to John as a prophet and "more than a prophet" (Mt. 11:9; Lk. 7:26).

Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the significance of the acclamation, it must be pointed out that, according to the Synoptics, Jesus was also acclaimed a prophet by the people, e.g., in Luke 24:19 one of the men on the road to Emmaus refers to Jesus and says: "who was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people."[1] At least by implication, Jesus referred to himself as a prophet (Mk. 6:4; Mt. 8:28; Lk. 4:24; 13:33-34). The gospel of John uses the title of "the prophet" with Messianic connotations: first, in reference to John the Baptist (1:21, 25); again, in reference to Jesus (6:14; 7:40).

---

[1] Cf. Mt. 16:14; 21:11, 46; Mk. 8:28; Lk. 7:16, 39; 9:19.

The book of Acts refers to Jesus as being like Moses, the prophet, whose coming is foretold in Deut. 18:15-18 (3:17-26; 7:37).

According to Acts, prophecy was very much a part of the primitive community. The writer interprets the events of the day of Pentecost (2:4) as a fulfillment of the promises of Joel: "in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" (Joel 2:28). The nineteenth chapter of Acts depicts Paul baptizing about twelve disciples in Ephesus. After he baptized them and "laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them; and they spoke with tongues and prophesied" (19:6, 7). Acts also tells of a prophet, Agabas, who made predictions about future events (11:9; 21:10). In addition to this function, exhortation (15:32) and guiding the church by the Holy Spirit (13:1-2) are included.

Since this study will focus attention on Paul's concept of prophet and prophecy, for the time being, we shall pass over this aspect of the New Testament and consider the book of Revelation which is the work of a prophet (1:3; 22:2, 6), and whose writer refers to himself as a fellow servant with your brethren the prophets (22:9). In 2:20 "Jezebel," who calls herself a prophetess and teaches and beguiles men to practice immorality, is mentioned.

In addition to these positive statements about prophets and prophecy in the New Testament, numerous references to false prophets are included. Warnings against false prophets are found in the Synoptics (Mt. 7:15; 24:11, 24; Mk. 13:22) and in the Johannine literature (I John 4:1; Rev. 16:13; 19:20; 20:10). Even though these are negative statements, they serve to strengthen the assertion that prophecy was very much alive in the early church.

New Testament prophetic activity takes on more significance when it is seen against the background of the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature which reveals the place of prophecy in the thinking of the Jews prior to the time of Jesus. This literature indicates that there were two beliefs current at that time which are particularly relevant at this point; biblical scholars are in general agreement about both of them. First, there existed the belief that prophecy had ceased and there were no prophets in Israel, and, second, there was the definite hope that prophecy would return in the end age. There are numerous passages which substantiate these points.

Of the Old Testament passages which indicate that it was believed that prophecy had ceased, Ps. 74:9 is the most explicit:

> We do not see our signs;
> there is no longer any prophet
> and there is none among us who knows how long.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Mal. 4:5, 6; Zech. 13:4-6.

The book of Maccabees includes three references which point to the cessation of prophecy. I Mac. 4:41-46 recounts the story of the cleansing of the sanctuary and the altar of burnt offering which had been profaned. There was some question about what to do with the altar and finally "they tore down the altar, and stored the stones in a convenient place on the temple hill until there should come a prophet to tell what to do with them" (4:45-46). In 9:27 it is recorded: "Thus there was great distress in Israel, such as had not been since the time that prophets ceased to appear among them." In 14:41 we read: "And the Jews and their priests decided that Simeon should be their leader and high priest forever, until a trustworthy prophet should arise." The book of Syriac Baruch speaks as if there are no more prophets in existence: "But now the righteous have been gathered and the prophets have fallen asleep. . . . we have nothing now save the Mighty One and His law" (85:3).

In his dissertation "Rabbinic Views of Prophecy"[1] Bronznick includes a chapter entitled "Cessation and Reemergence of Prophecy." The central problem discussed in this chapter is not whether or not the Jews of that time believed that prophecy had ceased, because, as he says: "There is a concurrence of opinion, from the rabbis down to our times,

---

[1] Norman Bronznick, "Rabbinic Views of Prophecy," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1965).

that genuine classical prophecy ceased to exist sometime during the beginning years of the Second Temple."[1] The question revolves around differing opinions as to when prophecy ceased.[2] Bronznick cites many examples to show the discrepancies regarding time, e.g., "Ever since the latter prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi died, the Holy Spirit ceased from Israel,"[3] and "From the day the Temple was destroyed, prophecy was taken away from the prophets and given to the sages,"[4] and "The Greeks ruled in the fifty-second year of the Persian reign, and then died Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. At that time prophecy ceased from Israel."[5] It is not our concern to affix a date for the cessation of prophecy. For purposes of our study, the point is that the Rabbinic Literature reflects the belief of Judaism that prophecy ceased long before the time of the opening of the Christian era.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 230.

[2] J. Giblet, "Le Messianisme Prophétique," L'Attente Du Messie, ed. L. Cerfaux, J. Coppens, R. De Langhe, V. De Leeuw, A. Deschamps, J. Giblet, and B. Rigaux (Louvain: Desclée De Brouwer, 1954), pp. 94-95 discusses the time of cessation and on p. 95 asserts that the period of prophecy is an historical epoch and its disappearance can be assigned to a date.

[3] Tosef. Sota 13:4; B. T. Sota 48b.

[4] Mid. Ps. 3:7; Mid. R. and Tar. to Lam. 2:9.

[5] Seder Olam A., ch. 7.

There were no prophets during the intertestamental period unless Josephus, who was not born until 37 or 38 A.D., was correct in giving this title to John Hyrcanus.[1] In his description of this Jewish ruler of 135-105 B.C. Josephus writes: "He was the only man to unite in his person three of the highest privileges: the supreme command of the nation, the high priesthood, and the gift of prophecy. For so closely was he in touch with the Deity, that he was never ignorant of the future. . . ."[2] This is the only place where prophecy is attributed to an individual. Even here one must question whether this is the correct use of the word, for the element which Josephus stressed was prediction, as is indicated in this passage. However, he is probably reporting a well-established tradition concerning John Hyrcanus. Actually Josephus himself must have realized that, in the Old Testament sense, there were no prophets in Judaism, for in another passage he explicitly makes such a statement. In Against Apion he discusses the superiority of Jewish historical sources as over against those of the Greeks. He attributes this fact to the inspiration of the prophets of Israel. According to Josephus the history written since the time of Artaxerxes

---

[1] Franklin W. Young, "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-Examination," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 289-291 for a fuller discussion of this point.

[2] Josephus, The Jewish War, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. II of Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), ii.8.

has not been on a par with the earlier records, "because of the failure of the exact succession of the prophets."[1]

Josephus includes two other passages of interest to this study. He gives the accounts of two men who claimed to be prophets. In the Antiquities we read:

> During the period when Fadus was procurator of Judea, a certain impostor named Theudas persuaded the majority of the masses to take up their possessions and to follow him to the Jordan River. He stated that he was a prophet and that at his command the river would be parted and would provide them an easy passage.[2]

In the Jewish War we read:

> A still worse blow was dealt at the Jews by the Egyptian false prophet. A charlatan, who had gained for himself the reputation of a prophet, this man appeared in the country collected a following of about thirty thousand dupes, and led them by circuitous route from the desert to the mount of Olives.[3]

It is noteworthy that the people were willing to believe and to follow these false prophets. Miss Bowlin points out that this willingness indicates two things. First, it indicates "that there was a general expectation that prophecy would return to Israel. Had there been no such belief and hope the people would not have listened to anyone claiming to be a prophet." Second, it indicates "how fervently they hoped

---

[1]Josephus, Against Apion, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. I of Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), i.41.

[2]Josephus, Antiquities, trans. Ralph Marcus, Vol. IX of Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943), xx.97; cf. Acts 5:36; 21:38.

[3]Josephus, The Jewish War, ii.261; cf. Acts 5:36; 21:38.

for the return of prophecy. Their fervor outweighed their good judgment."[1]

In turning to a consideration of the second belief, we find that it is equally well attested. Even though it was firmly maintained that prophecy had ceased, there was a fervent hope that it would return. Consequently, it took on eschatological significance. It has been noted that the writer of Acts understood the activity of the day of Pentecost as a fulfillment of Joel's promise that prophecy would return in the last days. That Deut. 18:15-18 was interpreted as pointing to a prophet of the end time is reflected in Acts 3:22; 7:37.[2] Malachi 4:5, 6 predicts the return of Elijah.[3] I Mac. 4:45-46 and 14:41 reveal, not only that prophecy had ceased but also the almost desperate hope that a prophet would come at some future time.[4] Again, it is not our purpose to identify this future prophet but simply to establish the fact that he was expected.[5]

---

[1]Ruth Elizabeth Bowlin, "The Christian Prophets in the New Testament," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1958), p. 87.

[2]Philo, On the Special Law Books, trans. F. H. Colson, Vol. VIII of Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), i.65 refers to this passage and asserts that it has eschatological significance.

[3]Cf. Sirach 48:10f; I Enoch 89:52; 90:31.

[4]Cf. Test. Levi 8:14; Test. Benj. 9:2.

[5]Howard M. Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957), pp. 1-11 gives a brief survey of the various concepts of the Prophet or a prophet current in Judaism prior to the time of Jesus.

In Rabbinic Literature there are many statements to the effect that the reappearance of prophecy figures as part of the entire eschatological complex.[1] Apparently, basing their views primarily on the Joel passage the rabbinic hope centers, not so much on an individual prophet as on the prophetic activity of all men, e.g., "In this world prophecy was given to one in a thousand, but in the future world prophecy will be given to all men" (Lev. R. 1:14), or to all Israelites, e.g. "In the future world all Israelites will be prophets" (Mid. Ps. 11:1).

In the Dead Sea Scrolls we also find evidence that the coming of a prophet was part of the eschatological thinking. In the Manual of Discipline[2] there is an explicit reference: "Until the coming of the prophet and of both the priestly and the lay Messiah, these men are not to depart from the clear intent of the Law."[3] This passage has been the subject of much discussion in regard to interpretation and the identification of the prophet. This will be considered at some length in a later chapter. Now it must be stressed that, however this passage is interpreted, the fact is clear: a future prophet was a part of the Qumran expectation.

---

[1] Bronznick, op. cit., pp. 264-267 for specific references.

[2] Hereafter the Manual of Discipline will be referred to as IQS.

[3] IQS 9:11.

From this survey it is apparent that there existed in Judaism prior to the coming of Jesus the hope of the final age which was united with the expectation of the revival of prophecy. When the prophetic activity of the New Testament is viewed against this background of eschatological expectation, it takes on profound significance. Although scholars have asserted that prophecy was a vigorous force in the early church and have pointed out its eschatological significance, apparently no one has gone beyond this to study precisely what the prophetic function was in the Christian community.

A Survey of Work on the Problem

In 1900 Edward Carus Selwyn, in the preface to his book The Christian Prophet and the Prophetic Apocalypse, spoke of the New Testament prophets and their teaching as "the most important body of teachers and the most characteristic kind of teaching which have ever escaped notice, in their specific features, by theologians ancient and modern."[1] Although sixty-six years have passed since Selwyn made this statement, in general, it continues to hold true today.[2] The only later extensive work on New Testament prophecy is that of Guy, New Testament Prophecy. In addition to these two books, and

---

[1]E. C. Selwyn, The Christian Prophets and the Prophetic Apocalypse (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1900), p. vii.

[2]The dearth of literature devoted to the narrower field of prophet and prophecy in Pauline writing, which is our particular interest in this dissertation, is even more glaring.

articles in Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias, there are three doctoral dissertations, none of which has been published: Ruth Elizabeth Bowlin, "The Christian Prophets in the New Testament"; Johan Christiaan Beker, "Prophecy and the Spirit in the Apostolic Fathers";[1] and Sidney D. Crane, "The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament."[2]

Selwyn's book grew out of his doctoral dissertation on "The Authorship of the Apocalypse," and this continues to be his particular interest in the book. In chapter I, which presents a "Short Historical Outline of Christian Prophecy," and in chapter 7, "Other Prophets in Other Apostolic Writings," he gives some references to prophecy in Paul. However, in neither of these chapters does Selwyn analyse the function of prophecy for Paul. He seeks to establish a relationship between prophecy and apocalypse, i.e., revelatory utterances which are related to the future and whose content undergoes a change in Paul's writing. The discussion of Romans 8:20 as the utterance of a "marvelously true prophet" reveals something of Selwyn's understanding of the function of prophecy in the Pauline corpus:

---

[1]Johan C. Beker, "Prophecy and the Spirit in the Apostolic Fathers," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1955).

[2]Sidney D. Crane, "The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament," (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1962).

> Instead of a catastrophic end of the world, on which his thoughts used to dwell when he wrote his earlier epistles, they now dwell more and more upon a glorious future in which the kingdom of heaven is within us, and our bodies are the temple of the Holy Ghost.[1]

The prophet, in a word, is primarily concerned with matters of the future.

In New Testament Prophecy, its Origin and Significance, Guy includes two chapters, "Prophetism in Contemporary Religion" and "Prophetism--Hebrew, Greek, Christian," which depict Paul's milieu in regard to prophetism. He devotes one brief chapter to "Prophetism in the First-Century Church" in which he gathers all the references in Acts, the Pauline Corpus, Revelation and other Christian writings and draws some general conclusions about the characteristics of prophecy in the early church. He concludes that prophets "were to be found in every Christian center in the Roman world, and they evidently wielded a great influence, although already it was being recognized that there were possibilities of abuse."[2] He also points out that prophecy was, for the most part, a community movement. Paul's discussion in I Cor. 14:4ff. demonstrates that "the prophets exercised their powers in the Christian meeting."[3] Further, he notes that the figures

---

[1] Selwyn, op. cit., p. 6.

[2] Guy, op. cit., p. 104.

[3] Ibid.

of the solitary prophet of the Old Testament had almost disappeared; in the New Testament they appear in groups. Moreover, prophecy was no longer limited to a few: "Prophetism had truly become democratized and 'all the Lord's people,' if they were not actually prophets, had, at least, the capacity for becoming prophets."[1]

In discussing the purpose of prophecy Guy does little more than quote I Cor. 14:3: "He who prophesies speaks to men for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation." In this connection he pursues only οἰκοδομέω, upbuilding, and rejects the "modern interpretation of building up the church in terms of increase of numbers, consolidation of organization, establishment on a firm basis of theological doctrine or the application of Christian ethical principles to life."[2] According to Guy, the thing which really built up the church was "the apocalyptic hope of the return of Christ in triumph. Anyone who fed this hope and at the same time restrained its more extravagant expressions 'built up' the church."[3] This leads Guy into a discussion of the relationship of Christian prophetism and apocalyptic expectation. In this connection he alludes to the tension between 'inaugurated' and 'futuristic' eschatology and states: "As the case of Paul himself shows, the Christian apocalypse was not con-

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., p. 105. [3] Ibid.

fined to revelation of the future. The prophets were not apocalyptists in any narrow sense."[1] Though Guy does refer to this relationship between Paul's concept of eschatology and prophecy, he does not really deal with it, nor does he discuss Paul's concept of the Holy Spirit in relation to prophecy and eschatology.

Nowhere in this chapter does Guy discuss what the prophet actually did, what concrete contribution he made to the life of the Christian community as opposed to the apostle and teacher. Guy reveals his own awareness of this deficiency when he begins the final section, "The Function of the New Testament Prophet," by saying: "The office of the prophet in the New Testament was thus not a clearly defined one."[2]

Guy includes one provocative section on "Paul as a Prophet," which is also discussed by Rengstorf in his book, Apostleship.[3] Guy and Rengstorf, along with other scholars,[4] point out the parallels between Paul and the Old Testament prophets. However, these parallels have been used to support

---

[1]Ibid., p. 107. [2]Ibid., p. 115.

[3]Karl Heinrech Rengstorf, Apostleship, trans. J. R. Coates (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952), pp. 53-62.

[4]Hans Windisch, Paulus und Christus (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1934), pp. 134-138; Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, trans. Frank Clark (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959), pp. 25-33; and Jacob M. Myers and Edwin D. Freed, "Is Paul Among the Prophets?" Interpretation, XX (1966), 40-54.

Paul's strong sense of apostleship; they are not discussed in terms of what they reveal about Paul's concept of prophecy.

In her dissertation "Christian Prophets in the New Testament," Miss Ruth Bowlin begins with a consideration of prophecy in the Old Testament, the Intertestamental Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls. She makes the point, which we have attempted to make, that, during the intertestamental period, it was believed that prophecy had died, and that there was fervent hope that 'in the end age' it would return. In other words, prophecy had eschatological significance. In her consideration of New Testament prophets Miss Bowlin discusses Jesus' fulfillment of the Jewish expectation of 'the Prophet,' mentions certain prophetic characteristics of John the Baptist, and then deals more fully with the prophets who followed Jesus. Her observations regarding Paul's concept of prophecy are consistent with those of Guy and do not go beyond them.

Sidney D. Crane, in the introduction of his dissertation, "The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament," states that his study does not concentrate on the "message or teaching of the prophets in the New Testament." He limits his attention "to the materials in the New Testament which have any bearing on the describing of the prophetic type of personality or the defining of the prophetic."[1] It is primarily the prophetic

---

[1] Crane, op. cit., p. xiv.

activity of Jesus which is the subject of Crane's analysis. Except in chapter IV, other New Testament passages are discussed simply by way of illustration. In chapter IV Crane does discuss Paul's concept of the function of prophecy, which, he asserts, is building up the church; he does not spell out what this means in specific terms.

Johan Christiaan Beker, in his dissertation "Prophecy and the Spirit in the Apostolic Fathers," is primarily concerned to show why the office of prophecy declined after the time of Paul. Because he believes the answer is to be found in the change of theological climate, he examines Paul's concept of prophecy and its relationship to his concept of the Holy Spirit. Beker contends that Paul's eschatology determines the concept of the Spirit in the church, and the Spirit, in turn, determines the status of the ministries, including prophecy. In Pauline thinking the eschatological hope is very much alive, and the Spirit is the down payment of the end and seals the church and the end. As an active agent of the Kingdom of God in the world the Spirit operates in the church and diversifies itself in specific charismata. Therefore, all ministries in the church derive their authority from the same Spirit, which is given to the church as such. The Spirit which operates in apostles, prophets and teachers is the same Spirit which makes Christians new beings. This means that the ethical propensities of the Spirit are not

divorced from its inspirational propensities. Yet the ethical criterion is decisive: agape (love) and oikodome (upbuilding) determine the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ. Further, Beker says that there is no qualitative difference among the gifts of the spirit but, only, a functional difference. The crux of the matter is that in Paul's thought the Spirit is the power through which Christians are enabled to be what they are and to live according to the law of Christ.

Professor Beker's dissertation is very helpful, especially his treatment of the relationship of prophecy to the Holy Spirit. However, he does not deal with the function of the prophet and prophecy nor with the nature of the prophetic word.

Prophecy, of course, emerges in any discussion of church order in the early church. The thesis of Harnack in The Mission and Expansion of Christianity[1] is that two distinct kinds of ministry existed side by side in the early church: universal and local. Apostles, prophets, and teachers, deriving their authority from the Holy Spirit, had a scope of activity theoretically coextensive with the church universal. Presbyters, bishops, and deacons, elected by popular vote,

---

[1]Adolf Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, trans. James Moffatt (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1908).

served the local church. Streeter denies that there is evidence in the early Christian literature for any such clear delineation as Harnack sets forth. He asserts that there was no single system of church order, with particular officers performing similar tasks in different churches throughout the world, laid down by the apostles. After surveying the New Testament and other first century Christian writings, he concludes that the church developed in a very haphazard manner. He says: "The church was an organism alive and growing--changing its organization to meet changing needs."[1]

In Church Order in the New Testament Schweizer presses very hard for the thesis that there is no trace of ministerial office or order in the New Testament, except in the Pastorals, which, most scholars today believe reflect a later period (ca. 100). Schweizer does seem to admit that the prophets played an important role in the life of the early church when he says: "The prophet, a church member called by the Spirit, can again become a decisive voice in everything."[2] However, he seems to play down the decisive role of the prophet in other passages when he says that, according to Paul, "everyone should really be a prophet"[3]

---

[1]B. H. Streeter, The Primitive Church (New York: MacMillan Co., 1929), p. 267.

[2]Eduard Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament, trans. Frank Clarke (London: S. C. M. Press, 1961), p. 50.

[3]Ibid., p. 197.

so that the church is a church of prophets. In his discussion of the Corinthian correspondence Schweizer states: "Paul knows no one in Corinth to whom he could apply as a leader to achieve an ordered observance of the Lord's Supper for instance, or of worship; he can appeal only to the church as a whole."[1] One can only wish that Schweizer had gone further in his consideration of the nature and function of the prophetic word. He simply refers to the prophetic function as that of preaching and asserts: "In the name of the risen Lord the prophet confronts the church and says what he has to say in the actual situation. It is not instruction, but a straight talk demanding a 'Yes' or 'No'."[2]

In Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht von Campenhausen, consistent with Schweizer's view, denies that the Pauline church had a graded and layered organization; it was a unified, living cosmos of free spiritual gifts.[3] Von Campenhausen does admit that certain people were elected to do particular tasks as the occasional need arose, e.g., I. Cor. 16:3; II Cor. 8:19, 23; Phil. 2:25 indicate that suitable men were selected for jobs. He includes teachers and prophets in this type of selection and says that they were not to be thought of as unsteady enthusiasts.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 101. [2] Ibid., pp. 222-223.

[3] Hans Frhr. von Campenhausen, Kirchliches Amt und Geistliche Vollmacht in den Ersten Drei Jahrhunderten (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953), p. 69.

[4] Ibid., p. 72.

Greeven, in "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus,"[1] addresses himself to the question of whether all, or a few, can prophesy and concludes that prophecy, in Paul, cannot be limited to a particular class or group.

From this brief survey it is apparent that, in discussions of church order or the ministry in the early Christian community, the particular question at hand is not the function of the prophet or the nature of the prophetic word. These writers pursue the question as to whether or not there can be found in the New Testament a distinction between, or a separation of, the natural or elected offices and the charismatic ministries, and/or whether or not there are gradations of ministries or offices.

Approach to the Problem

As noted above, since prophecy played such an important role in the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature, and since the New Testament itself indicates that it was very much alive in the early Christian community, it seems probable that it played a much more significant role in the New Testament than has been recognized thus far. It seems even more likely in the case of the Pauline writings. We know from his own account (Gal. 1:13-2:10; Phil. 3:4-6) that

---

[1] D. H. Greeven, "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIV (1952), 1-43.

he was steeped in the Old Testament and Rabbinic Literature.[1] Also, since Paul lists the prophets second only to the apostles in his cataloguing of the gifts of the Spirit, it is evident that he did rate them very high. In this study we shall attempt to see why Paul gave them such a prominent place. In I Corinthians he states explicitly that the function of prophecy was for the "upbuilding and encouragement and consolation of men" (I Cor. 14:3). We shall ask what this meant precisely in the church. Did Paul think of prophet and prophecy in terms of the Old Testament prophets? If so, in which terms: the ecstatic? the predictor of the future? the interpreter of current political events? What, for Paul, was the nature of the prophetic word? These are questions which will concern us in this study.

After a consideration of prophecy in the Old Testament and New Testament, paying particular attention to the Pauline writings, the working hypothesis of this dissertation emerged: In the writings of Paul the essential function of the prophet is an ethical one.[2] It is true that Paul uses the words

---

[1] Cf. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S.P.C.K., 1948) for a convincing study of the rabbinic background of Paul.

[2] Alv Kragerud, Der Lieblings Jünger im Johannesevangelium (Oslo: Osloer Universitätsverlag, 1959), who maintains that the Johannine literature was produced by a prophetic circle, has pointed to the ethical function of the prophet. Writing about prophets he says: "Sie sind nicht nur Träger evangelischer Tradition und Vermittler theologischer Vertiefund und paränetischer Applikation derselben" (p. 89). Again: "Der Verfasser

'prophet' and 'prophecy' very few times,[1] and the only extensive treatment of them occurs in I Cor. 14. However, there are several related areas which throw light on the central questions.

In this study we shall begin with a consideration of the concept of prophet and prophecy in the Intertestamental Literature. We shall attempt to see what the Jewish expectations were regarding the prophet and prophecy in the eschatological age. The concepts were many and varied. The expectation of the prophet as lawgiver, in the sense of interpreter of the law, will be our particular interest because of the possible connection between the law and the prophet in Paul's writings.

In the third chapter we shall concentrate on Paul's concept of the Holy Spirit. First, we shall draw attention to the close relationship between prophecy and the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature. Then we shall seek to see what light Paul's concept of the Holy Spirit may throw on his understanding of prophecy. We shall attempt

---

der Apokalypse ist nicht nur ein Apokalyptiker, der sich mit der Zukunft beschäftigt. Wie die jüdische Apokalyptik aus gelehrten Kreisen stammt, so befindet sich unser Verfasser in einem festen Traditionszusammenhang, wenn er zugleich deutlich Züge des Lehrers aufweist, was besonders an der Rolle der Paränese und der Eifersucht um die rechte Lehre erkennbar wird" (P. 94). This is not, however, Kragerrud's major thesis, and he does not develop it in this work.

[1] Προφητεία, six times; Προφητεύειν, six times; Προφήτης five times.

to show that, although the function and purpose of the Holy Spirit cannot be limited to one aspect, certainly, one of its distinctive functions is ethical. Because the Holy Spirit and prophecy are so closely associated, it can reasonably be inferred that one of the primary functions of prophecy is also ethical.

As stated earlier, although it has been demonstrated convincingly that there are definite parallels between Paul and the Old Testament prophets, particularly Jeremiah, no one has studied the significance of this for Paul's concept of prophecy. This will be our task in chapter four. We shall attempt to demonstrate, first, that Paul does conceive of himself as being in the Old Testament prophetic tradition, not only in the parallels between himself and them in regard to his call, but also in the depiction of himself in the role of servant, in the role of one who suffers as a result of his vocation and as the 'mouthpiece of God.' Then we shall try to see what significance this has for Paul's concept of prophecy. We shall ask why Paul frequently uses Old Testament prophetic appellations and attributes in discussing his apostolic role. Why did he use prophetic terms in defending his authority as an apostle? We shall attempt to show that he used them because he believed that, as an apostle of Jesus Christ, he had a particular task to perform; he selected prophetic terms, because they are indicative of the nature

of his peculiar apostolic work. Among scholars there is general agreement that Paul had an overwhelming sense of a special vocation to preach to the gentiles. The proclamation of the gospel to non-Jews involved, among other things, a new interpretation of the law. We shall argue that it was this task which prompted Paul to describe his apostleship in prophetic terms.

The last chapter will be devoted to a study of I Cor. 14 with special reference to its context and relationship to chapters twelve and thirteen. Also, particular attention will be paid to a study of the words related to prophet and prophecy which occur in this chapter. It is our contention that Paul purposefully placed his only extensive treatment of prophecy immediately after his extended statement regarding love. We shall try to show that love is the law of the Christian life and the prophet is the interpreter of this law. He speaks to the gathered community, the community gathered for worship, and seeks to interpret in concrete terms what the law of love means for particular situations.

For Paul, one of the primary functions of the Christian prophet, like the Old Testament prophets, was an ethical one. Paul's letters indicate that he adopted the view, reflected in the Intertestamental Literature, that the prophet of the eschatological age would be an interpreter of the law. However, for the Apostle, the prophet is the interpreter of the new law, the law revealed by Christ--the law of love.

CHAPTER II

PROPHECY AND THE LAW

In the last chapter we saw that, prior to the time of Jesus, the Jews believed that prophecy had ceased. At the same time they fervently hoped for its return. There was no uniformity regarding the hope, because the concepts of prophet and prophecy were not homogeneous. For centuries they had played rich and varied roles in both the Hebrew and Greek worlds, and their definition cannot be limited to one particular concept.

Background--Concepts of Prophecy

A study of the Old Testament, alone, reveals the complexity of the concept of prophecy. Von Rad, discussing the lack of uniformity in the Old Testament use of the term 'prophet,' says that the question of the origins of prophecy is a difficult problem, because the source material is scanty and does not allow any kind of homogeneous picture. He cites various texts to show that different terms, e.g., 'seer,' 'man of God,' are used interchangeably with 'prophet,' and states: "We can be reasonably sure that, if the sources use a number of different terms for prophet, this indicates in the last analysis that there were different kinds of prophets and different kinds of prophecy."[1]

---

[1]Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 7.

The Hebrew term for prophet is נָבִיא.[1] This term presents a problem, because as Napier says: "We simply do not know and cannot now determine the original meaning of the root."[2] It is now generally agreed that it does not come from נָבָא, "to bubble up, as if nabi were one who bubbles up under inspiration."[3] A widely held hypothesis is that the root of נָבִיא is derived from the verb meaning 'to call' or 'to announce,' which is suggested by the Arabic and Akkadian cognates.[4] Even if we could be certain about the original meaning of the root the fact remains that the term embraces a number of different concepts of 'the prophet.' Napier suggests the breadth of range of the application of the term in the Old Testament when he says:

> It is applied to a remarkable range of characters appearing from Genesis (20:7) to Malachi (4:5), and to surprisingly disparate personalities from an Aaron (Exod. 7:1) to an Elijah (I Kings 17-19; 21), from the 'true' to the 'false' (e.g., I Kings 22), from the relatively sophisticated (the Isaiahs, e.g.) to the relatively primitive (e.g., I Sam. 10), from the highly visionary (see Ezek. 1-2) to the concretely ethical (Amos; or Nathan in II Sam. 12; or Elijah in I Kings 21), from the seemingly objective perspective (of an Amos, e.g.) to the intensely participating attitude (of a Jeremiah).[5]

When we go beyond the Old Testament to consider the prophet in the Intertestamental Literature, we find that the concept is

---

[1]Von Rad says that this is the common Hebrew term for prophet; B. Davie Napier says that it is the "only term appropriately so translated," in "Prophet, Prophetism," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 896.

[2]Ibid.

[3]A. D. Davidson, "Prophecy and Prophets," A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings, IV (1902), 108.

[4]Napier, op. cit., p. 897. [5]Ibid., p. 896.

not uniform. It has been pointed out in Chapter I that Josephus emphasized the element of prediction in prophecy. He attributes the name 'prophet' to John Hyrcanus because of his ability to foretell the future.[1] Josephus never actually refers to the Essenes as 'prophets,' but he says that "there are some among them who profess to foretell the future." Seldom were they found to err in their predictions.[2] He cites two instances of Essene predictions which were fulfilled: Judas predicted the murder of Antigonus,[3] and Menahem foretold the reign of Herod.[4] Josephus also mentions Simon, another Essene, who correctly interpreted the predictive dream of Archelaus.[5]

Josephus portrays himself as a prophet. "He was an interpreter of dreams and skilled in divining the meaning of ambiguous utterances of the Deity; a priest himself, and of priestly descent, he was not ignorant of the prophecies in the sacred books."[6] During the Roman war, when Josephus received Nicanor's demand for his surrender, he was inspired to see a greater meaning behind the events, and he decided to go over to the Romans not as a traitor but as a minister of God.[7] When Josephus was taken by the Romans he requested and received a private interview with Vespasian and his son Titus. He declared that he was a messenger

---

[1]Josephus The Jewish War xiii.10.7.

[2]Ibid. ii.8.2. [3]Ibid. i.3.5.

[4]Josephus Antiquities xv.10.5.

[5]Josephus The Jewish War ii.7.3.

[6]Ibid. iii.8.3. [7]Ibid.

sent by God. His message: "You will be Caesar, Vespasian, you will be emperor, you and your son here." At first Vespasian was skeptical, but after he found that Josephus "had proved a veracious prophet in other matters,""he was inclined to believe him and he gave him many gifts, "and continued to treat him with kindness and solicitude, being warmly supported by Titus in these courtesies."[1] Whether we consider Josephus a genuine prophet, or not, is beside the point. It is clear that he regarded prophecy as primarily predictive.

Another aspect of prophecy is emphasized in the writings of Philo of Alexandria. Philo, a Jew, was steeped in Greek philosophy, and he sought to bring the insights of philosophy to bear on the teachings of the Old Testament. Wolfson, in an excellent study of Philo's concept of prophecy, says: ". . . his own ultimate views on prophecy, like all his religious views, were formed from certain basic conceptions derived from Scripture and reshaped and restated in terms borrowed from philosophy."[2] For Philo the link which connected Hebrew and Greek concepts of prophecy and the aspect which consumed most of his attention was inspiration. In describing prophetic inspiration he frequently used the term "ἔκστασις". Guy asserts that "the basic principle of Philo's view is, 'No prophecy without ecstasy'."[3]

---

[1]Ibid. iii.8.9.

[2]Harry A. Wolfson, Philo, Vol. II (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 11.

[3]H. A. Guy, New Testament Prophecy (London: Epworth Press, 1947), p. 128.

This means that the rational faculty of man moves outside the human body, and he is possessed by Another and reveals knowledge which lies beyond the grasp of sense-perception. Philo writes:

> For no pronouncement of a prophet is ever his own; he is an interpreter prompted by Another in all his utterances, when knowing not what he does he is filled with inspiration, as the reason withdraws and surrenders the citadel of the soul to a new visitor or tenant, the Divine Spirit which plays upon the vocal organism and dictates words which clearly express its prophetic message.[1]

In another passage the 'Another' who prompts the prophet is identified with God. "For the prophet is the interpreter of God who prompts from within what he should say."[2]

That Philo considers divine possession to be the essence of prophecy is shown in his discussion of the sources of prophecy. Wolfson points out that Philo makes a distinction between prophecies which have been spoken to a prophet directly by God and prophecies which have been spoken by him (the prophet) under divine possession, i.e., words communicated by the divine spirit. Philo shows what he considers the narrowest definition of prophecy when he refers to the second type of prophecy and says: ". . . the speaker appears under that divine possession in virtue of which he is chiefly and in the strict sense considered a prophet."[3]

---

[1]Philo On the Special Law Books iv.49; cf. Who is the Heir, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, Vol. IV of Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), p. 266.

[2]Philo On Rewards and Punishments, trans. F. H. Colson, Vol. VIII of Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939), ix.55.

[3]Philo Moses, trans. F. H. Colson, Vol. VI of Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935), ii.191.

This consideration of Philo's concept of prophecy recalls the ecstatic behavior of some of Israel's pre-classical prophets who became overwhelmed by the Spirit of God and prophesied in unintelligible speech (II Kg. 18:28-29; I Sam. 10:5-13; 19:18-24). R. B. Y. Scott points out that the prophets who engaged in this kind of dervish ecstatic activity often practiced "among the ignorant and superstitious mass of people, who credited them with power to call fire from heaven, to vanish, to cure poisoned springs, to curse objects of their ill-will, to multiply food, to revive the dead, to heal leprosy and to make iron float."[1] Some used their so-called prophetic powers for making money and for wielding influence. So much so that the classical prophets drew a sharp distinction between themselves and those who prophesied for the wrong reasons.[2] The point is that the concept of prophecy in Judaism at the beginning of the Christian era was not a uniform one. A consideration of what the Jews expected with the return of the prophet and prophecy also reveals a lack of uniformity.

Various scholars have undertaken the study of the different expectations of the eschatological prophet with the hope that it would throw light on the messianic concepts prevalent in

---

[1]R. B. Y. Scott, Relevance of the Prophets (New York: MacMillan Co., 1951), pp. 47-48; cf. II Kg. 1:10; 2:16, 19-22, 24; 4:42-44; 5:1ff; 6:6.

[2]Cf. Amos 7:14-15; Micah 3:5,11; Jer. 14:14.

Judaism and, in turn, on Christology.[1] Teeple in his monograph, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, includes a helpful survey of the various Jewish concepts of a prophet, or the Prophet, who would come in the new age.[2] He classifies the expectations according to identity or according to function. After reviewing the possibilities for the first category, he concludes: ". . . there was not agreement about the identity of the Prophet. He might be anonymous, or he might be Elijah, Jeremiah, or Joshua."[3] As the title indicates, for Teeple the great contender was Moses or a prophet like Moses.

At this juncture it must be pointed out that our particular objective is not to determine whether or not the expected prophet was thought of in terms of Messiah, nor is it to determine the identity of the expected prophet. It is the role of the coming prophet which concerns us. We shall focus on Teeple's second category i.e., the beliefs regarding the function of the prophet in the messianic time. Our interest in the identity of the expected prophet will be limited to the insights it gives into the task which the Jews hoped he would perform.

When we turn to a consideration of the function of the expected prophet, we find again there is no clear, unequivocal,

---

[1]Cf. Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. Shirley C. Guthrie (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 13-50; Reginald Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), passim.

[2]Howard M. Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957), pp. 1-11.

[3]Ibid., p. 11.

uniform concept. Cullmann gives a review of these expectations; his summary indicates the variety of beliefs:

> He preaches, reveals the final mysteries, and above all restores revelation as God had given it in the law of Moses. But he does not simply preach as did the earlier prophets; his proclamation announces the end of this age. His call to repentance is God's last offer. Thus his coming and his preaching as such constitute an eschatological act which is a part of the drama of the end. Although by its very nature the principal function of the Prophet is to reveal the will of God, his function is also to establish the tribes of Israel (Ecclus. 48:10). The task of Elijah redivivus is to overcome the world powers and to redeem Israel. He has to do battle with the Antichrist. He shares the fate of suffering with the ancient prophets.[1]

In the concluding chapter of his book Teeple asserts that the two major forms of the belief based on the functions of the coming prophet are 'Prophet'King' and 'Prophet-Lawgiver.'[2] The Jewish idea of the prophet performing the function of giving new instruction or interpreting the law is of special interest because of its possible relation to Paul's concept of the prophet and prophecy. Therefore, we shall focus our attention on this belief that the prophet would come as lawgiver or interpreter of the law. As background for this study of prophet as lawgiver a consideration of the Jewish belief concerning the role of the law in the messianic age will be helpful.

---

[1]Cullman, op. cit., p. 22

[2]Teeple, op. cit., pp. 102-115.

Law in the Messianic Age

The importance of the law in Judaism cannot be over-emphasized. After the return of Israel from exile a movement was begun by Ezra which resulted in the Torah's becoming the cornerstone of Jewish life. Herford describes it:

> To live for the Torah, by the Torah and with the Torah was the ideal which Ezra cherished for the national life; that was what the Jew must strive for, work for, and to that he must give the devotion of his whole life--a devotion without qualification or reserve, a whole-hearted allegiance to the will of God set forth in the Torah.[1]

By the first century this movement had reached full fruition, and the Jews had become "the people of the Book."[2] This being true it is not surprising that the observance of the Torah figured in the Jewish ideas about the messianic age.

As far back as Jeremiah we find the view that in the future time Yahweh will write His law upon the hearts of the people and it will be obeyed spontaneously (Jer. 31:33-34). In Ezekiel 36:27 we read: "And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutesand be careful to observe my ordinances." Isaiah 2:1-5 and Micah 4:1-5 predict that Yahweh will teach the people, and his law, his word will go forth from Jerusalem.

The Pseudepigrapha also teaches that the Torah has a role in the messianic age. In the book of Jubilees we read:

---

[1]R. Travers Herford, The Pharisees (Boston: Beacon Press, 1962), p. 58.

[2]D. S. Russell, Between the Testaments (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), pp. 41ff. for a full discussion.

> And in those days the children shall begin to study the laws,
> And to seek the commandments,
> And to return to the path of righteousness. (23:26)

W. D. Davies, citing I Enoch 49:1-3, points out that the Pseudepigrapha taught that the Messiah would be wise and an exponent of the Torah, and the later Rabbinic Literature reveals the same attitude.[1] Moore asserts that it was inevitable that the rabbis would be concerned about the role of the Torah in the messianic age. He writes:

> Inasmuch as the days of the Messiah are the religious as well as the political consummation of the national history, and, however idealized, belong to the world we live in, it is natural that the law should not only be in force in the messianic age, but should be better studied and better observed than ever before; and this was indubitably the common belief.[2]

Since it is beyond doubt that the law was expected to play an important role in the messianic age the question is: what would be the nature of the law? Teeple has organized the Jewish views in three categories: the view that the Mosaic law would be unchanged, the view that the Mosaic law would be given a correct and final interpretation, and the view that a new law would replace the Mosaic law.[3] For convenience we have adopted these categories for our discussion.

---

[1]W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S. P. C. K., 1948), p. 72; cf. Hermann L. Strack & Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, Vol. I (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928), pp. 1-2 for a discussion of this.

[2]George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era the Age of the Tannaim, Vol. I (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), p. 271.

[3]Teeple, op. cit., pp. 14-27.

Immutable Law

The view of the immutability of the Mosaic law was dominant in Judaism. W. D. Davies describes the attitude: ". . . it was impossible that it (the written Torah) should ever be forgotten, no prophet could ever arise who would change it, and no new Moses should ever appear to replace it."[1] I Enoch 99:2 refers to the Torah as the "eternal law." I Baruch 4:1 describes it as "the Law that endures forever." In Tobit 1:6 its prescriptions are an "eternal commandment." Josephus says of it: ". . . our Law at least remains immortal; and there is not a Jew so distant from his country, so much in awe of a cruel despot, but has more fear of the Law than of him."[2] Philo, who represents Hellenistic Judaism, also emphasizes this idea:

> But Moses, is alone in this, that his laws, firm, unshaken, immovable, stamped, as it were, with the seals of nature herself, remain secure from the day when they were first enacted to now, and we may hope that they will remain for all future ages as though immortal, so long as the sun and moon and the whole heaven and universe exist.[3]

Moore includes a full discussion of the rabbinical views on the unchangeableness of the Torah and states that their doctrine is well-expressed by Matthew 5:18, "For truly, I say to you, 'til heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished."[4]

---

[1]W. D. Davies, "Law in First-Century Judaism," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 95.

[2]Josephus Against Apion, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. I of Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), ii.95.

[3]Philo Moses ii.14. [4]Moore, op. cit., pp. 263-280.

Interpretation of the Law

Although the view of the immutability of the law was dominant in Judaism, there was also a belief that there would be a further, a definitive, interpretation of the Torah in the messianic era. No doubt, Teeple is correct when he says: "This belief had its origin in the fact that the interpretation of the Torah was such a controversial issue."[1] Such a development is inevitable for it is impossible to think that any law could be so inclusive as to determine every circumstance of life. This issue goes back to Deuteronomy 16:18 where judges are appointed to make decisions about the execution of the law.[2] However, the great impetus for interpretation and adaptation of the law came at the time of Ezra when, as we saw, the Hebrew people returned from exile and made the law the central and integrating factor of their life. It became imperative to interpret it correctly. Bright writes:

> As the law gained in importance, so grew the importance of its right interpretation and application. At first no one standard recension of the Pentateuch existed, with the result that it was not always possible to be sure what the law was. Further, law did not always agree with law, nor was its application to particular cases always clear. All this necessitated the development of hermeneutical principles for the further definition of the law, in order that it might actually be applied to the whole of life.[3]

---

[1]Teeple, op. cit., p. 18.

[2]Cf. Deut. 17:9-11; Ex. 18:20.

[3]John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), p. 423.

The wise men, the sopherim, had their origin in conditions such as these. The exact origin of the wise men, or scribes as they came to be called, is unknown, but it was during the restoration under Ezra that they emerged definitely as experts and specialists in teaching and interpreting the law. Ezra was a scribe par excellence; he is described as "a scribe skilled in the law of Moses" (Ezra 7:6), and as one who "had set his heart to study the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach His statutes and ordinances in Israel" (7:10).

Eventually the scribes founded schools and gathered around them devotees who were attracted to their particular doctrines and methods of interpreting scripture. They studied the Torah not only from an abstract, theoretical standpoint, but also occupied themselves with determining its practical and ethical applications. In other words they tried to interpret the law in such a way that men could apply it to their daily lives. Guignebert, talking about scribes, says: "They were not only jurists and canonists, but also moralists and casuists."[1] He goes on to say that about the time of the beginning of the Christian era the scribes became "distracted by various different scholastic tendencies." The schools varied somewhat in their spirit, and "the divergence is noticeable in the details of their interpretations of the Law."[2]

---

[1]Charles Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus Christ (New Hyde Park: University Books, 1959), p. 69.

[2]Ibid.

A famous instance of diverging views of rabbinic schools is that of Hillel and Shammai who were active biblical scholars at the time of Herod the Great.[1] Because of different temperaments and backgrounds these men developed different approaches to the interpretation of the law. Guignebert warns against over-simplification in regard to these approaches. However, he, Shürer, and Moore agree in their judgment that "Hillel, in his exposition of the obligations imposed by the Torah, emphasized neighborly love and spirit of conciliation, while Shammai, in similar cases, insisted on strict observance and of the absolute authority not only of the commands of the Torah, but of the jurisprudence of the Scribes."[2] The division between the two men was perpetuated by their schools known as the "House of Hillel" and the "House of Shammai." According to Moore: "More than three hundred conflicting deliverances of the two schools on matters of law and observance are reported in one connection or another in the Talmud."[3]

---

[1]Cf. Emil Shürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Div. II, Vol. I, trans. John McPherson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890), pp. 351-379 for a discussion of the famous scribes of the early period and their views.

[2]Guignebert, op. cit., p. 70; Shürer, op. cit., p. 361; Moore, op. cit., p. 79.

[3]Ibid., p. 81; cf. S. Mendelsohn, "Bet Hillel and Bet Shammai," Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isidore Singer, III (1902), 115.

Moore tells a picturesque story which illustrates the kind of difficulties which occupied the scribes. It concerns Hananiah ben Hezekiah, a prominent member of the school of Shammai just prior to the fall of Jerusalem. There had been a great deal of controversy over the book of Ezekiel. Some of the learned considered putting the book away, because it contained teachings contradicting the Pentateuch. Hananiah, using three hundred jars of oil, "sat in his study on the roof of the house until by a profounder exegesis he harmonized them."[1]

The two Jewish parties, the Pharisees and Sadducees, which originated during the Greek period, also held conflicting views regarding the Torah. The precise date of the origin of the Pharisees and Sadducees is not known. The primary historical source, the writings of Josephus, mentions them during the reign of the Hasmonean ruler, John Hyrcanus (135-105 B.C.). At this time there was great pressure on the Jews to conform to Hellenism. The Sadducees, intent on maintaining the status quo, were willing to go a long way in compromise. The Pharisees, on the other hand, refused to compromise. It might be supposed that the Pharisees were religiously more conservative, but this is not the case. Josephus writes:

> For the present I wish merely to explain that the Pharisees had passed on to the people certain regulations handed down by former generations and not recorded in the Laws of Moses, for which reason they are rejected by the Sadducean group, who hold that only those regulations should be considered valid which were written down (in Scripture), and that those which had been handed down by

---

[1]Moore, op. cit., pp. 246-247.

> former generations need not be observed. And concerning these matters the two parties came to have controversies and serious differences, the Sadducees having the confidence of the wealthy alone but no following among the populace, while the Pharisees have the support of the masses.[1]

The essential cleavage between the Pharisees and Sadducees may be stated briefly: the Sadducees accorded authority to the written text alone and rejected the unwritten, traditional Torah; Pharisees adhered to the written Torah and the oral Torah, i.e., the Torah interpreted according to tradition. It is obvious that the interpretation of the law was particularly important to the Pharisees. Josephus says in another passage that they were noted for their strict accuracy in interpreting the law and their scrupulous adherence to it.[2]

Another group of Jews, members of the Qumran community, devoted themselves to the practice of biblical interpretation. Brownlee believes that "the importance of Biblical interpretation to ancient Judaism is one of the facts limelighted by the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls."[3] From a study of the community's Commentary on Habakkuk[4] Brownlee has arrived at what he thinks were the hermeneutical principles or presuppositions of these interpreters of the law.[5] Some scholars disagree with Brownlee

---

[1]Josephus Antiquities xiii.10.6.

[2]Josephus The Jewish War i.5.2.; ii.8.4; Antiquities xvii.2.4.

[3]William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," Biblical Archeologist, XIV (1951), 54.

[4]Hereafter the Commentary on Habakkuk will be referred to as I QpH.

[5]Ibid., pp. 54-76.

regarding the exact method of exegesis used by the community, but for this study the point is that the community was engaged in studying and interpreting the law as well as the prophets.[1] It is generally agreed that exegesis was inaugurated by the founder of the sect, the Teacher of Righteousness, who was an interpreter of scripture. In I QpH he is described as "the priest in (whose heart) God has put (wisdom) to interpret all the words of His servants the prophets" (7:4f).[2]

The thinking of the Qumran community is particularly significant, because they believed they were living in the last days before the coming of the Kingdom of God. They searched the scriptures to learn the meaning of the current events. To prepare for the arrival of the Kingdom they had withdrawn into the desert in response to Isaiah 40:3: "In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." I QS includes this passage in connection with the expressed purpose of the community:

> to study the law which God commanded through Moses to the end that, as occasion arises, all things may be done in accordance with what is revealed therein and with what the prophets also have revealed through God's holy spirit.[3]

---

[1]Cf. the following for discussions of the method of exegesis: Lou Silberman, "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Commentary (I QpHab.)," Revue de Qumran III (1961-62), 321-364; Karl Elleger, Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten-Meer (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953), pp. 163-164; F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's, 1959), pp. 7-17.

[2]Brownlee translation.

[3]I QS viii. 14-15, trans. Theodor Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1956).

The importance of the study of the law is also seen in the community's rule that a man must commit himself to return to the Mosaic law before he could become a full-fledged member.

> Everyone who is admitted to the formal organization of the community is to enter into a covenant in the presence of all fellow-volunteers in the cause and commit himself by a binding oath to abide with all his heart and soul by the commandments of the Law of Moses. . . .[1]

After admission a member must continue to study and practice the law. He had "to do what is good and upright in His (God's) sight, in accordance with what He had commanded through Moses and through His servants the prophets."[2] According to I QS vi.24ff. any backsliding was severely punished (cf. viii.21-25).

It took only ten men to constitute a community organization. Provision is made in I QS for the continual study and interpretation of the law in each community.

> And in whatever place the ten are, there shall not cease to be a man who expounds the Torah day and night continually, expounding orally each to his fellow. And let the Many keep awake in the Community a third of all the nights of the year in order to read aloud from the Book and to expound laws and to bless in Community.[3]

Teeple refutes the scholars who regard "this as an indication that there was one man, probably a priest, chosen as the leader of each unit of ten, whose job was to interpret the Torah to the other nine." He says that probably the phrase רעהו איש (each to his fellow or companion) means that the men took turns in expounding and interpreting to the others." Teeple is convincing

---

[1] I QS v.8-9; cf. Damascus Document xv.8-9, Gaster trans.

[2] I QS i.2, Gaster trans. [3] I QS vi.6,8, Brownlee trans.

when he supports this view by showing that I QS includes statements which indicate that any member, not just certain leaders, could interpret, e.g., 8:11-12, 26.[1] Brownlee would agree with Teeple, because he interprets the passage "to mean that the night was divided into three equal parts, with the Community (by shifts) filling the whole of every night with oral midrash (or Biblical interpretation)."[2]

That the men of Qumran were convinced they were the correct interpreters of scripture is shown by the psalms of the Hymns of Thanksgiving.[3] Brownlee points out two of these psalms in particular which confirm that "the conflict between the sectaries of the scrolls and their opponents centered upon the question of Biblical interpretation."[4] He translates relevant passages.

> I thank Thee, O my Lord,
> For Thou has (fixed) thine eye upon me
> And hast rescued me
> From the envy of false interpreters
> And from the congregation of expounders of smooth motif
> (ii.31-32).
>
> But as for Thy people,
> (Lying preachers) flatter them,
> And decitful interpreters lead them astray,
> And they are hurled down through lack of insight,
> For their deeds are sheer madness;
> For I am despised by them
> And they have had no regard for me, despite Thy display

---

[1]Teeple, op. cit., p. 19.

[2]Brownlee, op. cit., p. 57.

[3]Hereafter the Hymns of Thanksgiving will be referred to as I QH.

[4]Brownlee, op. cit., p. 59.

of strength in me;
For they have driven me from my country as a bird from its nest,
And all my friends and intimates are driven from me;
And they consider me a ruined vessel.
But they, lying preachers and deceitful seers, as they are,
Have plotted wickedness against me,
(Seeking) to exchange Thy Torah engraved upon my heart
For the smooth things (they address) to Thy people;
And they have withheld the drink of knowledge from the thirsty;
And for their thirst they give them vinegar to drink
In order to gaze upon their error (or staggering),
That they may act insanely at their festivals,
That they may be caught in their nets (iv.6-10).

Brownlee takes issue with Dupont-Sommer who interprets the 'smooth things' as an 'allusion to the Sadducees and to the laxity of their morals,' and says that more probably it is an allusion to the Pharisees, "who were constantly at pains to make the observance of the Torah easier for the common man."[1] Whether we agree with Dupont-Sommer or Brownlee as to the group being criticized, these psalms make it clear that the correctness of the interpretation of the scripture was a matter of crucial importance to the men of Qumran.

From this survey of relevant literature it is evident that with the rise of Judaism the interpretation of the law became a vital, controversial issue among many groups. Russell has suggested that the Jews may be called not only "the people of the Book," but also "the people of biblical exegesis."[2] What were the expectations regarding the interpretation of the

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), p. 178.

Torah in the age to come? As we shall see, since there was disagreement over the interpretation of the law in the present age, some Jews believed the messianic age would bring correct interpretation and an adequate explanation of all its difficulties and incomprehensibilities. There is evidence of the possibility that other Jews expected a new Torah. W. D. Davies has included an excellent discussion of these expectations in The Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come.[1]

There are many passages in the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature which indicate an expectancy for new instruction or teaching in the messianic age. This does not necessarily mean new Torah in the sense of a whole new set of laws. More probably it refers to further interpretation or explanation of the old Torah. In the Old Testament we find passages which reflect the hope of new instruction. In Jeremiah 3:15 God speaks: "And I will give you shepherds after my own heart, who will feed you with knowledge and understanding." In Ezra 2:63 and Nehemiah 7:65 the governor tells the people not to eat the most holy food until a priest shall arise with Urim and Thummin. Teeple points out that these "were stones used in divination which answer questions with 'yes' or 'no' and thus give new instructions from God."[2]

---

[1]W. D. Davies, The Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952). Davies has included this material plus a discussion of related Dead Sea Scroll material in The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), pp. 122-190. We shall discuss the material only briefly; for a detailed discussion see Davies' works.

[2]Teeple, op. cit., p. 23.

In the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha we find the same hope for further illumination. IV Ezra 6:28 expresses the belief that "truth, which for so long a time has been without fruit, shall be made manifest" in the messianic age. The passages in I Maccabees, which we cited as indicative of the Jewish belief that prophecy had ceased and the hope of its return, reflect the expectation of new instruction for situations not covered by the Torah.

> They deliberated what to do about the altar of burnt offering, which had been profaned. And they thought it best to tear it down, lest it bring reproach upon them, for the Gentiles had defiled it. So they tore down the altar, and stored the stones in a convenient place on the temple hill until there should come a prophet to tell what to do with them (iv.44-46).

This passage comes in the context of the story of Judas Maccabaeus purifying the temple after he had taken Jerusalem from the Greeks. The altar of burnt offerings, which had been profaned, still stood, and the Jews were uncertain about what to do with it. As Giblet points out, we see here a group of men who had considerable respect for the law and they are confronted by a situation not foreseen by the law. The discussion is not like that of the Pharisees who would have resorted to subtle reasoning on a few obscure texts.[1] After deliberation they decided to wait for the pronouncement of a prophet "who should speak authoritatively in the name of the Lord."[2]

---

[1]J. Giblet, "Prophetisme et Attente d'un Messie Prophete dans l'Ancien Judaisme," L'Attente du Messie, ed. L. Cerfaux, J. Coppens, R. de Langhe, V. de Leeuw, A. Descamps, J. Giblet, and B. Rigaux (Louvain: Desclee de Brouwer, 1954), p. 105.

[2]Davies, Setting. . . ., p. 143.

The same idea emerges in I Maccabees 14:41:

> And the Jews and their priests decided that Simon should be their leader and high priest for ever, until a trustworthy prophet should arise.

Again, a tentative decision is made regarding an important issue. Simeon "had been instituted as leader and priest by merely human hands: the belief that the throne belonged to the descendants of David and the priesthood to the sons of Zadok was a living one."[1] Therefore, the present decision will be valid only until the appearance of a prophet who will make the final decision.

The Qumran community, as we saw, was preoccupied with the study and interpretation of the Mosaic law. They were convinced that theirs was the true interpretation. A study of the Dead Sea Scrolls reveals that they believed even their exposition of the Torah would be valid only until the advent of the messianic age. In I QS 9:9-11 we read:

> They shall depart from none of the counsels of the Law to walk in the stubbornness of their hearts, but shall be ruled by the primitive precepts in which the men of the Community were first instructed until there shall come the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.[2]

It should be noted that this text does not identify the rules which the community follows with the Mosaic law. The rules were the community's interpretation of the law of Moses. Also, as Davies points out, this text does not suggest the prophet will

---

[1] Ibid., p. 144.

[2] Trans. G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1962).

bring a new law, but "the very clear impression is that the rules governing the life of the community would be open to change on his coming. Thus, the rules of the Manual constitute an interim programme."[1]

The idea of an interim programme, or interim ethic, is also found in the Damascus Document.[2] The members of the community must "act according to the prescription of the Law as it was taught unto the forefathers until the period of these years shall be accomplished."[3] Again in 6:14 ". . . let them take care to act accordingly to the exact interpretation of the Law which is fit during the time of the wickedness. . . ."

The Rabbinic Literature[4] also contains passages which reveal the belief that there would be a form of the Torah which

---

[1]Davies, Setting. . . ., p. 148.

[2]Hereafter the Damascus Document will be referred to as CD.

[3]CD iv.8, trans. Geza Vermes, Discovery in the Judean Desert (New York: Desclee Co., 1956).

[4]The difficulties in using rabbinic literature must be pointed out. The dating of rabbinic literature is very problematical. Some passages are anonymous and cannot be dated. Other passages have a late date which means the content may represent the thinking of that period. However, these passages cannot be discounted, because they possibly represent an oral tradition which has been transmitted for centuries and illustrates the perseverance of a particular idea in Judaism. Apparently no rabbinic work was written prior to or during the beginning of the Christian era. The earliest available work is the Mishnah which did not assume a fixed or official form until ca. 190-200 A.D. It is clear that any use of rabbinic sources must be considered somewhat tendentious. Scholars rightly warn against using rabbinic literature as the decisive source for the thinking of Judaism at the beginning of the Christian era. Other sources must be consulted, e.g., Davies, Paul. . . ., p. 3 and Morton Smith, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century," Israel, ed. Moshe Davis (New York: Harper & Bros., 1956), pp. 67-81 who point out the heterogeneity of first-century Judaism. In this discussion we have sought to show that the

would take precedence over the present one, not in the sense that it would supersede the old, but it would be the final, authoritative form. Some passages suggest that certain observances concerning the sacrifices and festivals will no longer be necessary in the messianic age, e.g., in Leviticus Rabbah 9:7[1] it is said: "In the time to come all sacrifices will be annulled, but that of thanksgiving will not be annulled, and all prayers will be annulled, but (that of) thanksgiving will not be annulled." The Midrash Tehillim on Ps. 146:7[2] suggests that there will be changes in the laws regarding things clean and unclean.

Davies points out that the rabbinic literature expresses also the expectation that the difficulties or incomprehensibilities of the Torah in the present age will be adequately explained and comprehended in the messianic age. In the future age all obscurities will be removed. One of the reasons for this idea of future teaching and interpretation is that the Jews needed an answer for the Gentiles who raised questions about the inexplicable and irrational demands of the laws. This view is reflected in Numbers Rabbah 19:8:

---

crucial ideas are represented not only in rabbinic literature but also in other Jewish sources. Cf. Joseph Bonsirven, Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ, trans. William Wolf (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), pp. vi-xi for a good discussion of the use of Jewish sources.

[1]Midrash Rabbah, trans. under editorship of H. Freedman (London: Soncino Press, 1939), hereafter all references from the Midrash will be taken from this edition unless otherwise specified.

[2]The Midrash on Psalms, trans. William G. Braude (New Haven: Yale University, 1959).

> An idolater asked R. Johanan b. Zakkai (50-100 A.D.): 'These rites that you perform look like a kind of witchcraft. You bring a heifer, burn it, pound it, and take its ashes. If one of you is defiled by a dead body you sprinkle upon him two or three drops and say to him: "Thou art clean!"' R. Johanan asked him: 'Has the demon of madness ever possessed you?' 'No,' he replied. 'Have you ever seen a man possessed by this demon of madness?' 'Yes,' said he. 'And what do you do in such a case?' 'We bring roots,' he replied, 'and make them smoke under him, then we sprinkle water upon the demon and it flees.' Said R. Johanan to him: 'Let your ears hear what you utter with your mouth! Precisely so is this spirit a spirit of uncleanness; as it is written, And also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land (Zech. xiii.2). Water of purification is sprinkled upon the unclean and the spirit flees.' When the idolater had gone R. Johanan's disciples said to their master: 'Master! This man you have put off with a mere makeshift but what explanation will you give to us?' Said he to them: 'By your life! It is not the dead that defiles nor the water that purifies! The Holy One, blessed be He, merely says: "I have laid down a statute, I have issued a decree. You are not allowed to transgress My decree"; as it is written, This is the statute of the law' (Num. xix.2).

Davies, commenting on this passage, says: "But although theirs was not to reason why in this world, the rabbis were convinced that the messianic age would bring with it an explanation of the inexplicable demands that the Torah made in this world."[1]

He cites Numbers Rabbah 19:6

> That they bring thee a Red Heifer (19:2) R. Jose b. Hanina (ca. 150) expounded: The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses: To thee I shall disclose the reason for the Heifer, and to anybody else it is a statute. For R. Huna said: It is written, when I take the appointed time, (i.e., in the World to Come), I Myself will judge with equity (Ps. 75:3) (i.e., reveal the reasons for My Laws), and it is also written, And it shall come to pass in that day, that there shall not be light, but heavy clouds and thick--wekippa'on (Zech. 14:6). The written form is 'Yekippa'on,' as much as to say: The things that are concealed from you in this world, you

---

[1]Davies, Torah. . . ., p. 68.

> will see in the World to Come, like a blind regains his sight; as it is written (Isa. 42:16), And I will bring by a way that they know not. . . .

A tradition in Genesis Rabbah 98:9 interprets Genesis 49:11 to mean that the Messiah will explain the Torah and give new instruction.

> He washeth his garments in wine, intimates that he (the Messiah) will compose for them words of Torah (propound new meaning and interpretations of the Torah); And his vesture in the blood of grapes--that he will restore to them their errors (he will point out where they have misunderstood the Torah).

From this survey it is clear that an expectation for a definitive interpretation of the law was current in Judaism prior to and during the time of Paul.

The New Law

Some passages in the Jewish literature indicate that at the beginning of the Christian era a new Torah was expected in the messianic age. However, they are few and not very convincing. Teeple calls attention to two texts in the Sibylline Oracles[1] which refer to a future heavenly law which would replace all others, including the Torah. In iii.373-375 we read: "For good law shall come in its fullness from the starry heaven upon men, and good justice, and with it the best of all gifts to men." In iii.757-758: ". . . a common law for men throughout all the earth shall the Eternal perfect in the starry heaven." One cannot accept this as a Jewish idea or belief because of the pagan

---

[1]According to H. C. O. Lanchester, "The Sibylline Oracles," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Vol. II, ed. R. H. Charles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 371, the fragments of book iii are most probably pre-Christian.

influence on this collection. Teeple asserts: "This idea probably was suggested by Greek ideals of a universal law of Nature."[1]

The idea of a new Torah is also found in the rabbinic literature. The Targum on Isa. 12:3[2] reads: "And ye shall receive new instruction with joy from the chosen of righteous." It must be noted that the term תורה (Torah) is not used, and the replacement of the old Torah is not stated. Certainly this text could not be used to prove a belief in the new Torah. According to Davies the most unambiguous reference to a new Torah occurs in Yalqut on Isa. 26 which he translates as follows:

> The Holy One, blessed be He, will sit in Paradise and give instruction (שרוי), and all the righteous will sit before him and all the hosts (lit. family) of heaven will stand on His right and the sun, and stars on His left; and the Holy One, blessed be He, interprets (שרוי) to them the grounds of a new Torah (תורה חשרוי) which the Holy One, blessed be He, will give to them by the hand of King Messiah.[3]

It must be noted this passage is very late.[4]

In addition to these references Davies discusses others which have been mistakenly regarded as representative of the same view. In his conclusions about the idea of a new Torah in the messianic age he is reticent to make a strong statement for its existence. He writes: "The evidence that we have been able

---

[1]Teeple, op. cit., p. 25.

[2]The Targum of Isaiah, trans. with editing by J. F. Stenning (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949).

[3]Davies, Torah. . . ., p. 74.

[4]Davies, Setting. . . ., p. 177.

to adduce in favor of a new Messianic Torah cannot be regarded as very impressive."[1] At the same time, he is unwilling to dismiss it and considers it compatible with first-century Judaism. He makes a strong case for the hypothesis that any references to the new Torah were deliberately omitted as a definite anti-Christian polemic. The Jews were agitated because of the Christian claim that they possessed a new law.[2]

A study of the New Testament, especially Matthew, reveals that Christianity, confronted with working out its own relation to the law, was a movement conversant with the views of Judaism regarding the Torah. Matthew, for example, portrays Jesus as the fulfiller of the law (5:17-20). He did not come to abolish the Jewish law nor to stand in opposition to Moses. According to the first gospel God has revealed His will, in part, in the law and the prophets. Now, in Jesus the intention of God's will is manifested completely. Throughout Matthew Jesus is depicted as being in opposition to the scribes and Pharisees, because they have failed to interpret and teach the law as God intended (15:3,6,8,9,14; 16:12; 21:33,41-46). However, his scathing criticism is not aimed at the law or at the Pharisees' concern for the law (in 5:20 he refers to the righteousness of the Pharisees). Jesus affirms the law. He goes further: he asserts that he is the full disclosure of the will of God; in his actions, his speaking and acting, he reveals the whole will of God.

---

[1]Davies, Torah. . . ., p. 90. [2]Ibid., pp. 86-90.

Matthew does not use the term 'new Torah,' but it is clear that he considers the words of Jesus as the new teaching, the law of the Messiah. Even a cursory reading of the first gospel leaves the impression that it emphasizes exhortation and instruction with regard to the Kingdom of Heaven. Whether or not we agree with Stendahl that Matthew is a handbook issued by a school,[1] it is evident that its author, in his treatment of the gospel, was primarily concerned to present the teachings of Jesus in a manner which proclaimed their authority for the Christians.

In this brief consideration of the future of the law in Judaism we have seen that it was expected to play a significant role in the messianic age. Some Jews expected the Mosaic law to remain unchanged; others expected cessation or changes of parts of it; still others expected new instruction in the sense of a final, authoritative interpretation. It is possible that some Jews expected a new Torah to replace the old one. Our primary concern is to discover the Jewish view regarding the relationship of the prophet to the function of interpreting the law or giving new instruction in the messianic age.

Prophecy and the Law

For early evidence of the belief in Judaism that a prophet would come and make final decisions concerning matters not covered by the law we turn again to I Maccabees. From I Mac.

---

[1]Krister Stendahl, The School of Matthew (Uppsala, 1954).

4:46 and 14:41 it is clear that some Jews of the intertestamental period looked upon their decisions as human and provisional. They awaited the appearance of a divinely-guided prophet who would make the ultimate decisions.

We saw that, after the cessation of prophecy, the scribes rose to the position of influence and importance, and the Jews became the people of the book. Dancy in his Commentary on I Maccabees says that the tendency of the law to usurp many of the functions of prophecy can be traced in I and II Maccabees.[1] From I Mac. 3:48, "And they opened the book of the law to inquire into those matters about which the Gentiles were consulting the images of their idols," we learn that the law gave a decision to most problems which confronted the Jews. However, this did not always hold true. I Mac. 4:41-46 and 14:41 are cases in point. The law provides no solution, and the authorities must wait for a prophet to speak the word of God. The prophet would, as Davies points out,

> be concerned with the interpretation of the Law: he would have to pronounce on a specific matter of Law
> . . . . . .
> Both passages . . . refer difficulties in interpretation to a coming prophet who should have communication from God which would solve these.[2]

In discussing these passages Giblet also points to the legalistic milieu which they reflect and asserts they give a new conception of the prophet, i.e., interpreter of the Law.[3]

---

[1]J. C. Dancy, A Commentary on I Maccabees (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), p. 2.

[2]Davies, Setting. . . ., p. 143.

[3]Giblet, op. cit., pp.105-107.

For Klausner the prophet of these passages "corresponds exactly to the well known Talmudic expression: 'It must be left until Elijah comes.'"[1] It is true, as we shall see, in the Rabbinic Literature a fervent hope for the return of Elijah as interpreter of the law and as judge of legal disputes is expressed. However, we must agree with Teeple who cannot accept Klausner's identification of the prophet of I Maccabees with the expected Elijah of the Talmud. Teeple observes that I Maccabees (125-100 B.C.) was written too early to be influenced by this rabbinic belief.

> It is probable that the function assigned to Elijah in rabbinic literature does not explain the traditions in I Maccabees, but rather the reverse process is true: problems which were difficult to settle caused the belief that some valid prophet would come to decide them, as in I Maccabees, and later some rabbis assigned this duty to Elijah when he would return.[2]

Davies thinks it is possible that the coming prophet of I Maccabees may be based on Deut. 18:15, "The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren, . . ." but he is emphatic in denying it can be interpreted messianically.[3] In both cases a definite article is missing, and this "should be given its full significance." The reference, probably a general one, may be made to any prophet who might appear in the future.[4] The hope for a prophet is

---

[1]Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, trans. W. F. Stinespring (New York: MacMillan Co., 1955), p. 260.

[2]Teeple, op. cit., p. 3.

[3]Cf. Dancy, op. cit., p. 186; W. Fairweather & J. Sutherland Black, First Book of Maccabees, Vol. LIV of Cambridge Bible for Schools & Colleges, ed. A. F. Kirkpatrick (Cambridge: University Press, 1895), p. 247.

[4]Davies, Setting. . . ., pp. 143-145.

"vague and almost formal: we have not yet progressed to the confident expectation of a Messiah."[1]

Although scholars disagree regarding the identification of the prophet who is expected in I Maccabees, there is general agreement that his function will be to make decisions about the law.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls we find a similar concept regarding the prophet's function regarding the law. We saw the Qumran Community's preoccupation with the Mosaic law. Convinced that they were the chosen community of the last days, this sect believed that its interpretation and the observance of the rules derived from this interpretation had eschatological significance. They considered their interpretation to be the correct one, but they also believed it would be superseded by a new one. Who will bring this new word regarding the law? I QS 9:9-11 clearly states that the community must observe the original rules "until there shall come a prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel."

This passage has been the subject of much discussion among biblical scholars who have tried to see what light it throws on the identity of the expected Messiah. That is not our question. Whether one argues for or against the identification of the Messiah with a (the) coming prophet this much is certain: in the I QS 9:9-11 the function of the prophet is directly related to the reinterpretation of the existing rules or law. Some

---

[1]Dancy, op. cit., p. 2.

scholars identify the Teacher of Righteousness with the coming prophet and see it as a fulfillment of Deut. 18:15.[1] Others see a possible identification with Elijah. Burrows says: "This prophet seems to be the most eligible candidate for identification with Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah. . . ."[2] All these scholars base their positions on the fact that the common factor is the law. The prophets, in all three cases are concerned with interpreting or giving the law. One must agree with Silberman when he says: "Thus one function of the nby' seems clear; he will deal with those legal problems that the community, in clinging to the 'ancient codes' (unlike its innovating rivals), cannot solve."[3] W. D. Davies in his effort to deny the identification of the Prophet with the Messiah affirms the relationship of the eschatological prophet with the interpretation of the law. He writes:

> One thing is quite certain: the sectarians expected the Messianic Age to remove the inadequacies of their understanding of the Law. While there is no suggestion that they anticipated any New Law (unless such be explicit in DSD iv.18ff., which is unlikely) in the 'making of the New' the law itself was not to escape attention: it too required redemption, at least in its interpretation. And one eschatological figure, at least, the Prophet, as New Moses, was to provide a new understanding of it. But this Prophet, while he accompanies the Messiahs, is not himself a Messiah . . . unless we are

---

[1]Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, trans. G. Vermes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961), pp. 94-95, 360-364; other scholars will be mentioned in the discussion which follows.

[2]Millar Burrows, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," Anglican Theological Review, XXXIV (1934), 205; cf. Chaim Rabin, The Zadokite Documents (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), p. 23, n. 11.2.

[3]Lou H. Silberman, "The Two 'Messiahs' of the Manual of Discipline," Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 80.

> prepared to accept the view that the Messiah of Aaron is Elijah redivivus, especially concerned with the interpretation of the Law (a view which cannot but be conjectural and tentative), then the function of interpreting the law is mainly connected with a figure, the Prophet, as New Moses, who accompanies the Messiahs, but is not to be confused with them.[1]

The close association of the prophet and law in the thinking of the Qumran community also emerges in the discussion of scholars who attempt to identify the Teacher of Righteousness and the prophet who is to come. Wieder makes this identification primarily on the basis of two passages in the Damascus document which mention an "Interpreter of Law." In CD 6:4ff. we read:

> The Well is the Law. And those that digged it are they that turned (from impiety) of Israel, who went out from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus,--inasmuch as God called all of them Princes, for they sought him, and their fame was not rejected by the mouth of anyone--and the Staff is the Searcher of the Law, as Isaiah said: Who bringeth forth a tool for his work. (Rabin's translation)[2]

In 7:8 we read:

> and the Star is the searcher of the Law who came (or: shall come) to Damascus, as it is written: A star shall step forth out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel--the Sceptre is the prince of all the congregation. (Rabin's translation)[3]

Wieder contends that I QS, which predicts the coming of a prophet, is an earlier work than CD.[4] He translates the text, "the Star is the searcher of the Law who came" and asserts that the Teacher

---

[1]Davies throws doubt on this hypothesis in Setting. . . ., p. 149. He says: ". . . the priority of DSD (Manual of Discipline) can be neither proved nor disproved, nor can the Teacher of Righteous be identified beyond doubt with the prophet expected in DSD."

[2]Rabin, op. cit. [3]Ibid.

[4]N. Wieder, "The Law-Interpreter of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Second Moses," Journal of Jewish Studies, IV (1953), 172.

of Righteousness is to be identified with the predicted prophet of the Manual and the Interpreter of the Law of the Damascus Document. For him it follows that this is the Mosaic prophet of Deut. 18:15-18. He says: "Like Moses of old, the primary task of the second Moses was to act as doresh ha-torah, as the authoritative teacher and exponent of the Torah. . . ."[1]

Some scholars think the Qumran sect expected the Teacher of Righteousness, although dead, to rise up again in the Messianic age.[2] In this way the Teacher is identified with the expected prophet. Teeple sees the prophet as the only logical choice of identification for the Teacher.[3] He points out that the Teacher, in the past was a lawgiver.[4] Also the sect expected new laws in the future and "apparently expected their Teacher of Righteousness to return then. . . ." This being true, says Teeple,

> . . . they must have thought that he would be the Prophet through whom God would give new laws. After all, who would be so qualified to give the new laws as the Teacher whom God in the past had chosen to receive the revelation of His marvelous secrets which He had not disclosed even to the canonical prophets?[5]

Raymond Brown is unwilling to accept the thesis that the Teacher of Righteousness will return in the messianic age.[6] However, he thinks it is not going too far to say that the Teacher

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Cf. Giblet, op. cit., pp. 127-129; Vermes, Discovery. . . ., pp. 220-222.

[3]Teeple, op. cit., p. 113. [4]Supra,

[5]Teeple, op. cit., p. 113, cf. Bruce, op. cit., p. 49.

[6]Raymond Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran," Catholic Biblical Review, XIX (1957), 75.

had an influence on Qumran messianism. He discusses the expected prophet and says: "Since the unknown is always imagined in terms of the known, it is most likely that the figure of the great anointed prophet and teacher colored the sectarians' image of the prophet. . . ."[1] As we saw the Teacher was, above all an interpreter of the law.

There is simply not enough evidence for absolute proof concerning the identity of the prophet. It is clear that scholars, no matter what position they take on the issue, are agreed that the eschatological prophet's primary function will be the interpretation of the law. All existing evidence confirms this view.

It should also be noted that another group of Jews, the Samaritans, looked forward to the coming of a Ta'eh, or 'Restorer.' There is general agreement among scholars that the Samaritan expectation is based on Deut. 18:15ff.[2] Black refers to this form of expectation as "one of the most striking points of contact between Samaritanism and the Scrolls. . . ."[3] One of the functions of this prophet, according to the Samaritans, will be the teaching of the law. "Apparently the teaching would not be new law, but rather the instruction of non-Samaritans in the

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Cf. Moses Gaster, The Samaritans (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), p. 91; Cullman, op. cit., p. 19; John MacDonald, The Theology of the Samaritans (London: S.C.M. Press, 1964), passim.

[3]Matthew Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), p. 158.

old-Samaritan law."[1] For the Samaritan woman of John 4:19,25 the Messiah will be a prophet who "will show us all things."[2]

In our study of the role of the Torah in the messianic age as it is depicted in Rabbinic Literature we found there is very little evidence that a new law was expected. It is entirely possible that the lack of references to a new Torah can be attributed to the fact that the Jews were trying to silence any such idea, because the Christians were claiming the possession of a new law. It may be for the same reason that there are no references to a new Moses. Since Moses was the giver of the old law, to speak of a new Moses would imply a new law.

Although a new Moses receives no place in Rabbinic Literature, Moses the prophet is idealized and glorified. "A prevalent idea in rabbinic literature is that Moses was the greatest of the prophets,"[3] Mishnah Sotah 1:9 refers to Moses and says: "Whom have we greater than Moses, for none other than the Almighty occupied himself with him. . . ."[4] As far as the rabbinical schools were concerned, Moore says, "the revelation of Moses was complete and final . . . Moses is the fountain head of prophecy in so literal a sense that it is said that he

---

[1]Teeple, op. cit., p. 64.

[2]Cf. J. A. Montgomery, The Samaritans (Philadelphia: John C. Winston Co., 1907), pp. 239-251; A. Cowley, "The Samaritan Doctrine of the Messiah," The Expositor, fifth series, I (1895), 161-174.

[3]Teeple, op. cit., pp. 38-39.

[4]The Mishnah, trans. Herbert Danby (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), hereafter all references from the Mishnah will be taken from this edition.

spoke all the words of prophets besides his own."[1] Deut. 34:10, "And there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face," is often quoted in the writings of the rabbis. The primary reason for the exaltation of Moses, the prophet, is attributed to his receiving and giving the law. As the significance of the law increased in Judaism Moses grew in stature as a prophet. It is particularly interesting that in Rabbinic Literature the concepts of law and prophet are brought together in one person--Moses, the fountainhead of law-giving and the fountainhead of prophecy.[2]

Although Rabbinic Literature gives little evidence for a belief in a new Torah, we found many references to the hope that the messianic age would bring a clear and indisputable interpretation of the law. Who would perform this task? According to Rabbinic Literature it is the prophet Elijah. This was not the only assignment which he received, for "of the various eschatological prophets Elijah became the most prominent and his role the most concrete and fully developed. . . . The functions assigned to him are quite varied."[3] Certainly,

---

[1]Moore, op. cit., p. 239.

[2]Josephus glorifies Moses the prophet as the earliest and best of all lawgivers (cf. Against Apion ii.154-175). Philo also glorifies Moses. In some of his treatises he speaks of him as 'prophet' as if this were his most important office (cf. On Dreams ii.189). In On Virtues 51 he refers to him as the 'prophet of the laws.'

[3]Cf. R. B. Y. Scott, "The Expectation of Elijah," The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought, III (1926), 490-502; Teeple, op. cit., pp. 4-5, for a discussion of the functions expected of Elijah when he returned.

settling disputes regarding the law would be one of his most significant duties. According to Ginzberg, in his study of Elijah, the rabbis conceived of him as one who would explain and adjust "all controversies and legal disputes which had accumulated in the course of time."[1] There are seventeen places where this idea is found.[2] Some of the passages speak of a knotty problem which must wait for decision until Elijah comes. In the T.B. Berakoth 35b,[3] for example, the discussion centers around whether or not wine can be the basis of a meal and thereby require blessings. One rabbi replied: "When Elijah comes he will tell us whether it can really serve as a basis; at present, at any rate, no man thinks of such a thing." In another passage, T.B. Pesahim 70a, one of the rabbis is disturbed by the interpretations of Shemiah and Abtalyon, "who are great sages and great interpreters (of the Torah)." He asks how they will justify their decisions to Elijah when he comes. One passage in the Mishnah, Eduyoth 8:3, states that Elijah will come "to bring agreement where there is matter for dispute. In a footnote related to this passage Danby comments: "He (Elijah) will make no change in the Law but only make an end of injustice."[4]

---

[1]Louis Ginzberg, "Elijah," Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isidore Singer, V (1902), 126. Several authors have referred to his work not available to this writer, Eine unbekannte judische Sekte (New York: 1922), pp. 303ff.

[2]Cf. Davies, Setting. . . ., p. 159 for a listing of the references.

[3]The Babylonian Talmud, trans. under editorship of I. Epstein (London: Soncino Press, 1948), hereafter all references from Babylonian Talmud will be taken from this edition.

[4]Danby, op. cit., 436.

The rabbinic view that in the future age it would be a prophet, as opposed to any other office, who would make clear the difficulties of the law is undoubtedly grounded in their view of the relationship between the prophet and law. Although the Jews believed that prophecy had ceased and had been superceded by law in Judaism, it must not be assumed that a basic antagonism existed between the two. On the contrary, the relationship between them was extremely close.

In the first place, law and prophecy have a common source--Mt. Sinai. The revelation of Mt. Sinai is conceived by the rabbis as the origin of all future prophecy. In Exodus Rabbah 28:6 we read:

> The prophets received from Sinai the messages they were to prophesy to subsequent generations; for Moses told Israel: But with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day, etc. (Deut. 29:14). It does not say 'that is not here standing with us this day,' but just 'with us this day'--these are the souls that will one day be created; and because there is not yet any substance in them the word 'standing' is not used with them. Although they did not exist, still each one received his share (of the Torah); for so it says. . . . Not only did all the prophets receive their prophecy from Sinai, but also each of the Sages that arose in every generation received his (wisdom) from Sinai. . . .

In commenting on this passage Bronznick says: "It merely denies the possibility of future prophecy without the benefit of the Sinaitic revelation. What it really aims to accomplish is to minimize the dichotomy between the Law and the prophets."[1] In Exodus Rabbah xlii.8 it is said that Moses spoke "all the

---

[1]Norman M. Bronznick, "Rabbinic Views of Prophecy," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1965), p. 143.

prophecies of others with his own, with the result that all who prophesied later were inspired by the prophecy of Moses."

In the Mekilta the prophets are referred to as 'keepers of the commandments,' i.e., 'guardians of the law.'[1] Other passages of Rabbinic Literature imply that if Israel had obeyed the law there would have been no need for prophecy, e.g., Nedarim 22b: "Had not Israel sinned, only the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua would have been given them, (the latter) because it records the disposition of Palestine (among the tribes)." Rabbi Freedman, the translator, adds the note: "But the other books, consisting mostly of the rebukings of the prophets, would have been unnecessary."[2]

The close relationship between the law and the prophets is also seen in the fact that the rabbis considered the prophetic activity as a link in the transmission of the law from Moses to themselves. In Mishnah Pirke Aboth 1:1, for example, we read: "Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets, and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue." There are some references to the oral law being passed from Moses to the sages by way of the prophets, e.g., in Mishnah Peah 2:6 we read: "Nahum the Scrivener said: I have received a tradition from R. Measha, who received it from his father, who received it

---

[1]Cited by Bronznick, op. cit., p. 160.

[2]Nedarim Vol. III, trans. H. Freedman, The Talmud, ed. I. Epstein (London: Soncino Press, 1936), p. 65.

from the Zuggoth, who received it from the Prophets as a Halakah given to Moses from Sinai."

According to Rabbinic Literature the source is not the only thing which the law and the prophet have in common. The scribe and prophet are closely related. "Even the task of the prophet is understood to be the same task as the task of the interpreter of the law: to teach the Torah to Israel."[1] Sometimes the rabbis describe the prophet as a scribe deciding the law, e.g., T.B. Yebamoth 16a speaks of an overturned mortar upon which Haggai is delivering three rulings in the same way as a sage. Other passages speak of the prophets as rabbis, e.g., T.B. Yoma 69b in reference to Jeremiah and Daniel.

Many texts indicate that the rabbis considered themselves the rightful heirs of the prophets. This goes back as far as Ezra who was the father of the scribes as well as a prophet. The rabbis claimed that when prophecy was taken from the prophets it was given to the wise men.[2] In Seder Olam Rabbah this injunction is found: "From here on (after the cessation of prophecy) incline your ear and listen to the words of the sages."[3] Bronznick cites several instances in rabbinic exegesis where a biblical verse is interpreted to refer simultaneously to prophet

---

[1]Nahum N. Glatzer, "Talmudic Interpretation of Prophecy," Review of Religion, X (1946), 128.

[2]T.B. Baba Bathra 12a.

[3]Ch. 30, cited by Bronznick, op. cit., p. 220.

and sage. He says: "In consequence, the prophets . . . were not to be restricted to the wearing of the mantle of prophecy on their shoulders, but they were also entitled to carry the crown of the Law on their heads."[1]

Herford in The Pharisees tries to demonstrate that there was no essential breach between the prophets and Pharisees.[2] What was needed, he contends, was a different method to impress upon Israel the need to adhere to God's law. The Pharisees had no idea of repudiating the prophetic teaching. They only wanted to make it effective. He refers to Pharisaism as 'applied prophecy' and says: "The Pharisees were precisely those who saved the work of the Prophets from being wasted, by infusing the spirit of their teaching into the moral and religious character of the people."[3]

Perhaps Herford overstates his case, but it cannot be denied that the Rabbinic Literature does not reflect a breach between the Pharisees and scribes and the prophets. It clearly holds the scribes to be the successors of the prophets. It became the duty of the scribes to interpret anew the Law of God so that it could be applied to human life and conduct. It is not surprising that when there seemed to be no solution to the problems of interpretation they looked for a prophet who would bring complete understanding of the law.

In this chapter we have sought to ascertain what the Jewish expectations were regarding the role of prophet and

---

[1]Ibid. [2]Herford, op. bit., pp. 137-138.

[3]Ibid., p. 138.

prophecy in the eschatological age. We saw that the concepts of the eschatological prophet were not homogeneous. On the contrary, the concepts were many and varied. The expectation of the prophet as lawgiver, in the sense of interpreter of law, has been our particular interest because of the possible connection between law and prophet in Paul's writings.

Our study of the Apocrypha, and Pseudipigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Rabbinic Literature has shown that all reflect a milieu involved in the correct interpretation of the Torah. The Jews were expectantly awaiting the messianic age when all the unanswered questions about the law would be answered and it would receive its final, authoritative interpretation. In all three we found the belief that this work of interpretation would fall on the shoulders of a prophet or the Prophet. No doubt, Matthew was sensitive to these Jewish expectations. He does not present Jesus as the giver of the new law; for Matthew Jesus brings the authoritative interpretation of the law. It remains for Paul to use the phrase νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ (law of Christ). What was the relation of the prophet to this law of Christ? This question will concern us in a later chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

One of the problems in the study of Paul's concept of prophecy is the paucity of material in his writings on the subject. He mentions it very few times (Rom. 1:2; 11:3; 12: 6; I Cor. 11:4; I Th. 2:15; 5:20) and discusses it extensively only once (I Cor. 12-14). Therefore one must consider areas closely related to prophecy for insight into its meaning. Because the Holy Spirit is closely related to prophecy in the Old Testament, Rabbinic Literature, and other New Testament writings, as well as in the Pauline corpus, we shall focus our attention on Paul's concept of the Spirit in this chapter.

The Relationship of Holy Spirit and Prophecy

In Paul's writings the relationship between prophecy and the Holy Spirit is never explicitly stated. However, prophecy is listed among the spiritual gifts in I Cor. 12. In I Th. 5:19-20 prophecy and the Spirit are mentioned together, if not identified: "Do not quench the Spirit, do not despise prophesying." It should not be surprising that Paul does not discuss the fact that prophecy and the Holy Spirit are closely related. Since the connection is found so often in the Old Testament,[1]

[1]G. W. H. Lampe, "Holy Spirit," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, II (1962), 627, says, "The primary manifestation of the Spirit in the Old Testament is prophecy."

Rabbinic Literature and the New Testament,[1] it may be assumed that it was an accepted fact at the time of Paul.

In the Old Testament account of Israel's early prophetic movement we find many examples which indicate the belief that prophecy was accompanied by the reception of the Spirit in some special way. For the ecstatic prophets the coming of the Spirit meant possession, e.g., I Sam. 10:6: "The Spirit of the Lord will come mightily upon you, and you shall prophesy with them. . . ."[2] The Spirit of the Lord fell upon Ezekiel, and he proclaimed doom to Israel on account of her evil ways (Ezek. 11:5). According to Isa. 61:1 the mission of the prophet is carried out because "the Spirit of the Lord God is upon him." The Lord sent "the law and the word" by his Spirit through the prophets (Zech. 7:12). In Micah 3:8 we learn that the true prophet, in contrast to the seers and diviners, speaks an ethical word and is described in terms of power, Spirit of the Lord, justice and might:

---

[1]Alv Kragerud, Der Lieblings Jünger im Johannesevangelium (Oslo: Osloer Universitätsverlag, 1959), points to the close association of prophecy and Spirit in the Johannine literature. Discussing the author of Revelation he says: "Die Propheten sind Träger des Geistes, was der Grund für ihre Sonderstellung in der Heilsökonomie Gottes ist. Wie sie δοῦλοι par excellence sind, so sind sie auch Pneumatiker par excellence. Der Prophet wird vom Geist ergriffen (1:10; 4:2; 17:3; 21:10), und durch den Propheten redet der Geist zu den Gemeinden (2:7,11,17,29; 3:6). So ist der johanneische Prophetismus das Organ der Pneumatokratie. Durch den Geist wirkt der Herr in seiner Kirche, wer den Geist repräsentiert, ist deshalb der Mittler zwischen Christus und den Gläubigen." (p. 98)

[2]Cf. Num. 11:25-29; I Sam. 19:20-24; I Kg. 22:24; II Kg. 2:9.

I am filled with power
with the Spirit of the Lord,
and with justice and might
to declare to Jacob his transgression
and to Israel his sin.

In Rabbinic Literature we also find a close connection between prophecy and the Spirit.[1] Schweizer writes: "In Rabbinic thought, 'the Spirit' is essentially the prophetic Spirit which speaks in the Old Testament."[2] According to Targum Isa. 40:13, the Lord directed the Holy Spirit in the mouth of all the prophets.[3] The Holy Spirit is the spirit of prophecy; all the prophets spoke by the Holy Spirit.[4] Besides the men who are named prophets in the Old Testament, Rabbinic Literature includes all inspired men such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David and Joshua. According to the Megillah there were forty-eight prophets and seven prophetesses in Israel.[5] The Holy Spirit is so closely identified with prophecy that when the

---

[1]Cf. J. Abelson, The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature (London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1912), pp. 238-267 for a good treatment of this subject; cf. also Paul Volz, Der Geist Gottes (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1910), pp. 78-80; Hermann L. Strack & Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928), Vol. I, p. 128.

[2]Eduard Schweizer, Spirit of God, trans. A. E. Harvey (London: A. & C. Black, Ltd., 1960), p. 7.

[3]Targum of Isaiah, trans. & ed. John F. Stenning (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), p. 132.

[4]Cf. George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era the Age of the Tannaim, Vol. I (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), pp. 237f.

[5]Megillah 14a.

last of the prophets died it was believed that the Holy Spirit ceased.[1]

I. Abrahams cites instances in the Rabbinic Literature in which the identification of the Holy Spirit and prophecy is absolute, e.g., in the Targum Isa. xi.2 the phrase "and the spirit of the Lord shall rest on him" is rendered "the spirit of prophecy shall rest on him."[2] In a footnote Abrahams says that the identification of prophecy and the spirit is probably seen most clearly in "the fact that the terms cited in Genesis Rabbah xliv.6 (ed. Theodor, p. 429) as describing prophecy are in another text (Aboth de R. Nathan 1 ch. 34, ed. Schechter, p. 102) cited with a single variant, as describing the Holy Spirit."[3]

The Old Testament and rabbinic identification of the Holy Spirit and prophecy is carried over to the New Testament. In Acts 28:25 the Holy Spirit speaks "through Isaiah the prophet." In II Peter 1:21 we read: ". . . no prophecy ever came by the impulse of man, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God." To explain the events of the Day of Pentecost Peter quoted Joel 2:28-29 where prophecy and spirit are identified.

It is evident that the close association of prophecy and the Holy Spirit was an undisputed fact in the Pauline background.

---

[1]Sanhedrin 11a; cf. Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. II, pp. 127.

[2]I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels (Cambridge: University Press, 1924), p. 127.

[3]Ibid., p. 127.

This evidence plus the close connection of the two in Paul's writings makes the study of the Holy Spirit in his letters a legitimate method for gaining insight into the Apostle's concept of prophet and prophecy.

Eschatological Significance of the Spirit in the Early Church

In order to grasp the significance of the Spirit in the teachings of Paul it is necessary to have a proper understanding of the Holy Spirit as an eschatological phenomenon, as a power of the 'age to come.' This requires a consideration of Jewish eschatological conceptions current in Paul's day.

The Old Testament and Apocalyptic Literature reflect the anticipation of the Jews for a grand and awful day when the will of God would be completely revealed and his way would become a reality. As Guy says, "The eschatology of the Old Testament prophets is summed up in the phrase 'The Day of Yahweh'."[1] Jewish Apocalyptic literature uses the phrase 'The Day of the Lord' by which the course of the world is divided into two distinct and separate ages, the 'present age' and the 'age to come.' For the Jews this is the crucial point in history. The 'present age,' dominated by evil and corrupt powers, is characterized by human strife, frustration and waiting. Paul speaks of the 'present evil age' (Gal. 1:4) which is under the control

---

[1]H. A. Guy, The New Testament Doctrine of the 'Last Things,' (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 13.

of evil rulers (I Cor. 2:8) and of a god who has blinded the minds of unbelievers (II Cor. 11:4). Those who are good, those who follow after God, are oppressed by the evil ones, helpless to better their situation.[1] The 'age to come' is characterized by blessedness, peace and goodness.

The hope of Judaism was that God would soon intervene with power and might and conquer the evil powers which hold sway over the 'present evil age.' At that time "frustration passes into peace, waiting ends, and God's promises of blessing find fulfillment."[2] The Jews expectantly waited for the 'Day of the Lord' which would mark the end of the 'present age' and the dawn of the 'age to come!!'[3]

The New Testament reveals a radical deviation from the late Jewish eschatology. The early church witnesses to its conviction that it already lives in the 'age to come.' The age of fulfillment has dawned. "What God foretold by the mouth of all the prophets . . . He thus fulfilled" (Acts 3:18). The eschatological significance of the Holy Spirit is manifested in

---

[1]Cf. Martin Rist, "Apocalyptism," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, I (1962) 158; Rudolf Bultmann, Primitive Christianity, trans. R. H. Fuller (New York: World Publishing Co., 1956), pp. 8-86.

[2]Albert Curry Winn, "Pneuma and Kerygma: A New Approach to the New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, 1956), p. 87.

[3]Cf. Albert Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. William Montgomery (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1931), pp. 75-100 for variations on this basic eschatological scheme which are found in Jewish apocalyptic writings.

that the early church appeals to His presence and work as evidence that the new age has dawned. We saw earlier that Judaism had relegated the activity of the Spirit to the past but looked forward to its revitalization in the future. There are numerous references to this expectation in the Old Testament, e.g., Isa. 44:2:

> I will pour my Spirit upon your descendants, and my blessing on your offspring.

In Ezekiel the idea recurs often, not only in the vision of the dry bones, where the nation is brought back to life by the outpouring of the Spirit (37:1-4), but also in passages such as 39:28-29:

> Then they shall know that I am the Lord their God because I sent them into exile among the nations, and then gathered them into their own land. I will leave none of them remaining among the nations any more; and I will not hide my face any more from them, when I pour out my Spirit upon the house of Israel, says the Lord God.

The promise of the outpouring of the Spirit is also found in the Intertestamental Literature, e.g., in the Book of Jubilees we read:

> And after this they will turn to Me in all uprightness and with all (their) heart and with all (their) soul, and I will circumcise the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their seed, and I will create in them a holy spirit. . . . (Jub. 1:23).

I. Abrahams points out that the Rabbinic Literature reveals the same expectation.[1] He cites Numbers Rabba xv.25

---

[1]Abrahams, op. cit., p. 127; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S. P. C. K., 1948) agrees with Abrahams and asserts: ". . . many Rabbinic references to the Holy Spirit have suffered conscious suppression because of the pneumatic emphasis of Christianity" p. 216.

which relates the prediction of Joel 2:28-29 to Numbers 11:17.

> The Holy One, blessed be He, said: In this world individuals were given prophetic power, but in the world to come all Israel will be made prophets, as it is said, (Joel 2:28): And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh. . . . Thus did R. Tanhuma son of R. Abba expound.

With this survey it is evident that, for the early church, the presence of the Spirit was an irrefutable witness that the 'age to come' had dawned. Judaism had looked forward to the messianic age as the age of the Spirit. The coming of the Spirit could only occur in the new age. No doubt when Peter quotes the promise as Joel gives it, he purposefully changes Joel's 'afterward' (μετὰ ταῦτα, LXX) to 'in the last days' (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, Acts 2:17). As Beker writes: "The consciousness of living in the 'last times' is the common experience of the early Christian church."[1] The presence of the Spirit makes it indisputable.

Paul's letters make it evident that he shares with the early church the belief that the Spirit was present, the power of the new age had invaded the present world. Paul, along with the primitive church, conceived of the Spirit in terms of power. The Apostle, as well as the writer of Acts, knows of the Spirit as a miraculous divine force, "a kind of invading energy enabling man to perform more than human deeds."[2] A. M. Hunter

---

[1]J. Christiaan Beker, "Aspects of the Holy Spirit in Paul," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, XIV (1958), 5.

[2]A. C. Purdy, "Paul the Apostle," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 698.

observes that in the early chapters of Acts the dominant characteristic of those who have received the Spirit is δύναμις (power).[1] We find the same idea in Paul's letters: "Does he who supplies the Spirit to you and work miracles among you do so by works of the law, or by hearing with faith?" (Gal. 3:5; cf. Rom. 15:18f.) "Our gospel comes to you not only in word, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and with full conviction" (I Th. 1:5).[2] Hunter writes:

> He, too, knows the same 'joy' and 'boldness' inspired by the Spirit, as the members of the primitive church knew. Like those earliest Christians he has felt the moving of the Spirit as he prayed. In short, Paul has himself experienced the same marvellous and manifold quickening of this strange, new supernatural power as those 'in Christ' before him. . . .[3]

The primitive church and Paul also agree that this power is the 'promised 'gift of God. Peter at Pentecost declares that the risen and exalted Jesus "having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this which you see and hear." He then calls the hearers to repentance and baptism with the promise, "You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:32-38). In Gal. 4:6 Paul also refers to the Spirit as a gift of God; in Gal. 3:14 he speaks of the Spirit as that which had been promised. For Paul and the early church the presence of the Spirit was a sign that the promise of God for the messianic era had been fulfilled. The power of the new age was a present reality.

---

[1]A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), p. 94.

[2]Cf. Rom. 15:13,19; I Cor. 2:4. [3]Hunter, op. cit., p. 94.

Eschatology and the Christian Life

Paul goes beyond the primitive church in his concept of the Spirit. His ideas about the Spirit were not exhausted with the conviction that his presence was an irrefutable witness to the dawn of the new age. The thinking of the Apostle about the Spirit as an eschatological phenomenon goes deeper. In all the writings of Paul there is an eschatological tension which embraces the whole of the Christian life. By its very nature as an eschatological phenomenon the Holy Spirit is related to this eschatological tension, and for Paul it is the force which pervades the total Christian existence.

The eschatological tension in Paul's letters has been the subject of much discussion among biblical scholars. Dodd, whose view is termed 'realized eschatology,'[1] emphasizes the idea that with the coming of Jesus 'the powers of the world to come" have begun to work in the present world. Although he admits that New Testament eschatology allows for finality at the end of all earthly existence,[2] he asserts: "an absolute end to history,

---

[1]C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1953), pp. 34-80. Dodd later acknowledged the inadequacy of this term. In his The Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), p. 447, n.1, he writes that he thinks 'inaugurated eschatology' better expresses his thought. He also likes Jeremias's 'sich realisierende Eschatologie,' which Hooke translates 'an eschatology that is in process of realization, cf. Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke (6th ed. rev.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p. 159.

[2]C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (New York: Harper & Bros., 1960), p. 93.

whether it be conceived as coming soon or late, is no more than a fiction designed to express the reality of teleology within history."[1] In another passage he emphasizes the absoluteness: "It would not be true to say that in the New Testament as a whole (whatever may be true of possible isolated passages) the ministry, death, and resurrection of Christ are regarded as merely provisional, or as anything short of the unique and absolute entrance of the Kingdom of God, the eschaton, into human experience."[2] For Dodd Paul was the first Christian to make an adequate presentation of 'realized eschatology.' He writes:

> It is in the epistles of Paul . . . that full justice is done for the first time to the principle of 'realized eschatology' which is vital to the whole kerygma. That supernatural order of life which the apocalyptists had predicted in terms of pure fantasy is now described as an actual fact of experience.[3]

Dodd attempts to show how Paul's early futuristic apocalypticism found in the Thessalonian letters is replaced by a clear-cut view of realized eschatology in his later letter, e.g., Romans and Philippians.[4] However, the criticisms of Hamilton and Lowe, who point out that in Romans there are definite references to futuristic eschatological events, make Dodd's view untenable.[5] Dodd attempts unsuccessfully to explain away some

---

[1]Ibid., p. 83. [2]Ibid., p. 93. [3]Ibid., p. 65.

[4]C. H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul I" and "The Mind of Paul II," New Testament Studies (Manchester: University Press, 1953), pp. 67-128.

[5]Neill A. Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, Ltd., 1957), pp. 53-70; John Lowe, "An Examination of Attempts to Detect Developments in St. Paul's Theology," Journal of Theological Studies, XLI-XLII (1940-41), 129-142; cf. also D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964), pp. 244-248 for a good treatment of Dodd's position and criticism.

of the futuristic passages and does not even attempt to deal with others. The futuristic aspect of Paul's eschatological thinking cannot be denied. He awaits the Parousia. He says: "But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body" (Phil. 3:20). He also speaks of a future judgment: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ" (II Cor. 5:10). He expects future glory: "I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us" (Rom. 8:18). In I Cor. 15:20-24 he sets forth the resurrection expectation.

Although Dodd overstates his case, the letters of Paul definitely manifest the belief that, with the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the long awaited messianic age had dawned. As we saw, the Holy Spirit was a witness to this fact. The power of the saving activity of God, promised for the new age, had been released. "He has delivered us from the dominion of darkness" (Col. 1:13). "He disarmed the principalities and powers and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in him" (Col. 2:5).[1] Man's redemption has been accomplished by the work of Jesus Christ. Paul proclaims: "He gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil age" (Ga. 1:4). Man has been reconciled to God by the death of His Son (Rom. 5:10). Therefore, Paul speaks of salvation as present reality

---

[1]Cf. Rom. 8:28; I Cor. 2:8.

(Rom. 8:24). For believers the old age has gone. Schoeps writes: "The eschatology of Paul . . . is distinguished from all forms of Jewish speculation by the fact that in consequence of the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead it considers the eschaton to have already begun. . . ."[1]

It is evident that Paul's thinking embraces both a realized and a futuristic eschatology. This is the eschatological tension, the 'already' and 'not yet.' The church lives in the 'time between.' Cullmann's popular analogy which distinguishes between the decisive battle won (D-Day) in the cross and its ultimate manifestation of victory (V-Day) is fitting at this point.[2] Batey writes of Paul's bride image as an appropriate symbol for his eschatology.

> To conceptualize the church as the bride of Christ is to maintain a tension ubiquitous in the New Testament. The church lives zwischen den Zeiten, where she experiences through faith the presence of her Lord and yet hopes for a future consummation. She finds pleasure and purpose, delight and design in both the realization and anticipation of her Lord. . . . The bride image is a salient symbol of realistic eschatology, which affirms that the God of history who has acted decisively in the past will completely reveal his sovereignty over creation.[3]

In the midst of this eschatological situation lies the Christian life. Because there is a tension in Paul's eschatology,

---

[1]Hans Joachim Schoeps, Paul; the Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, trans. Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), p. 98.

[2]Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time, trans. Floyd V. Filson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950), p. 141.

[3]Richard Batey, "Paul's Bride Image," Interpretation VII (1963), pp. 181-182.

his view of the Christian life presents a paradox. The believer is a citizen of two worlds, the 'present age' and the 'age to come.' His life is characterized by the 'already' and the 'not yet.' Precisely here Paul makes his "specific contribution to the experience of the Spirit as eschatological phenomenon in the early church."[1] He shares with the primitive church the living reality of the Spirit as a sign of the 'last times,' but he goes further. For Paul, the Holy Spirit is, on the one hand, the life-giving power by which men are brought into and sustained in the Christian life. On the other hand, the Holy Spirit points the believer to the future, to the unfulfilled. In the thinking of the Apostle, the Holy Spirit pervades the whole of the Christian life, past, present, and future.

The Holy Spirit and the Christian Life--Past

For Paul the Spirit is operative in a man's initial confession of faith; "it is the power which involves him (man) in the saving act of God in Christ. . . ."[2] The Spirit enables a man to confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. In I Cor. 12:3 we read: "No one can say Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit." Hamilton uses this passage to illustrate the Christocentricity of Paul's concept of the Spirit.[3] He points out: "Paul's use of the word εἰπεῖν (to say) rather than ὁμολογεῖν shows that he is not necessarily restricting his view to the special case

---

[1]Beker, op. cit., p. 6. [2]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 80.

[3]Hamilton, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

of being able to confess Jesus Lord in the face of martyrdom."[1] This text comes at the beginning of Paul's attempt to correct the thinking of the Corinthians regarding the spiritual gifts, i.e., the extraordinary gifts of glossalalia, healing, etc. With this announcement regarding the confession that Jesus is Lord he is concerned to show that anyone who becomes a Christian does so not because of "any religious impulses of his own"; becoming a Christian is ultimately due "to the enlightening power of the holy, divine Spirit of the true God."[2] "Nothing less is asserted in our passage than that the Spirit is responsible for the faith of primitive Christianity."[3]

The same idea is found in Gal. 4:6: "And because you are sons, God has sent this Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba, Father'." This sentence is introduced by ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί (and because you are sons). Burton points out that the ὅτι (because) is to be understood as causal, giving the reason for the act ἐξαπέστειλεν (has sent).[4] The death of Christ on the cross was the redemptive act which made it possible for Paul to say positively 'you are sons.' This is fact.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 8.

[2]James Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians of Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper & Bros., 1938), p. 179.

[3]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 9.

[4]Ernest D. Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians of International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1962), p. 221.

It remains for the Holy Spirit to bring man to a realization of this fact. The Spirit is the Spirit of adoption. He attests to man that he is a child of God. Christ completed the work of redemption. The Spirit "stamps us with a mark which indicates we belong to the Lord."[1] The Spirit, working in man, leads him to turn to God in faith. He provides the believer with the certainty of his sonship. Hamilton cites Fuchs: "The basic function of the Spirit of God is obviously to secure the relationship of faith to its object, Jesus Christ."[2]

It is significant that Paul used the phrase "Abba, Father." According to Mark 14:36 it was the cry of Jesus in Gethsemane. Jeremias has shown that Jesus' use of the Aramaic, Abba, manifests the awareness of a close and vital relationship between Himself and God. The phrase connotes so much familiarity that an orthodox Jew of the first century would not have dared use it in addressing God.[3] By attributing this primitive Christian cry, which is an echo of Jesus' own prayer, to the Spirit, Paul implies that He "performs His function of establishing a relationship between the believer and Christ in order that we should share the same attitude to the Father as does Christ."[4]

---

[1]Theo Preiss, "The Inner Witness of the Holy Spirit," trans. Donald G. Miller, Interpretation VII (1953), 276.

[2]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 11, Fuchs, Christus und Geist bei Paulus, p. 40.

[3]Joachim Jeremias, The Central Message of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), pp. 9-30.

[4]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 11; cf. also Rom. 8:15-17; Gal. 2:3.

The expression in Gal. 3:14: "that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith," and in Gal. 5:5: "For through the Spirit, by faith, we wait for the hope of righteousness," might appear to contradict Gal. 4:6. Schweizer says that such a contradiction is only a superficial one. He points out:

> The expression διά or ἐκ πίστεως is used continually in apposition to 'the works of the law,' ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and only means that it is not human merit which has earned the Spirit. In Gal. 5:5 the content of what is received is the expectation of the ἐλπίς δικαιοσύνης, that is, in fact, nothing other than faith understood in the light of the righteousness which has come to pass in Christ. This shows that the Spirit is not just an initial event.[1]

Schweizer's interpretation is helpful, but it does not settle the problem as to whether or not faith precedes the action of the Spirit. The difficulty lies in trying to establish a chronology. "It may be said that faith is neither prior to the reception of the Spirit so as to condition that reception, nor subsequent to it so as to be its consequent."[2] Faith, the activity of man, occurs simultaneously with the action of the Spirit. Robinson writes:

> Faith is the Spirit's work as much as any other part of the Christian experience. It is the inevitable human response to God when He is seen and known in His true nature as a living presence. We may call it a divine compulsion of man, if we remember that we are moving in a spiritual realm, where compulsion is conviction, and conviction is wrought only by the discovery of that which is.[3]

---

[1]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 70.

[2]Charles E. Craine, "The Significance of Paul's Teaching on the Holy Spirit for the Christian View of Man" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Drew Theological Seminary, 1951), p. 180.

[3]H. Wheeler Robinson, The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit (London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1928), p. 209.

The point is: for Paul the Holy Spirit plays a crucial role in the transference of man from the life of unbelief to belief.

In the Pauline letters it is baptism which symbolizes the death to the old life and a rising to the new. Paul's description of baptism in terms of the Spirit in I Cor. 12:13--"by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body . . . and all were made to drink of one Spirit"--states essentially what is expressed in I Cor. 12:3 and Ga. 4:6. Baptism is "the event which makes him (the believer) a Son of God and gives him life."[1]

The Holy Spirit and the Christian Life--Present

In the passages discussed in the last section the Holy Spirit was active in the decisive past event of the life of the Christian. In the next two sections we shall see that the Spirit plays a significant role in the present life and future expectations of the believer. Here we must note the persistent Pauline paradox. On the one hand the Apostle states that the Christian, the man who has transferred from the realm of unbelief to that of belief, lives on an eschatological plane, sharing the risen life of Christ (Gal. 2:20). Paul expresses this new condition of the man of faith in many ways. When a man responds to God in faith he no longer feels enslaved to the powers of the old world (Rom. 6:2ff; 7:1ff; Gal. 2:19; 5:24). He walks in newness of life (Rom. 6:4); he is a new creation (II Cor. 5:17). At the same time there are numerous passages which

---

[1]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 71; cf. Rom. 6:4.

indicate Paul's belief that the Holy Spirit has not yet transformed the whole of man (cf. Rom. 8:19-23). Tannehill says: "The new world and its salvation are already in the midst of the old world."[1] The believer remains in the world and must continue to carry the 'body of death' (Rom. 7:24); he must be reminded: "Do not yield your members to sin as instruments of wickedness" (Rom. 6:13). For the Christian there is a continuing struggle against the powers of the old aeon. "The believer is not simply dragged along by the Spirit as if he had no choice."[2] It is significant for our study that Paul expresses this paradox in terms of the Spirit because of its close relationship to prophecy. In this section we shall concentrate on those passages in which Paul emphasizes the domination of the Spirit in the present life of the Christian, the 'already' aspect of Paul's eschatology. In the next section we shall consider the role of the Spirit in the futuristic, the 'not yet' aspect.

For Paul, the Spirit is not only the power which is active in the constitutive phase of the believer's life, He also pervades his entire new life. The new life which the Spirit gives can be defined as life in and through the Spirit. Rom. 7:6 describes the believer as living "in the new life of the Spirit." In Rom. 8:9 the believer is said to be "in the Spirit." Paul often expresses the same idea with the phrase 'in Christ.'

---

[1]Robert C. Tannehill, Dying and Rising with Christ (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Topelmann, 1966), p. 74.

[2]Ibid., p. 81.

Deissmann observes: "The formula 'in Spirit' occurs in Paul nineteen times: it is connected with the same fundamental ideas as the phrase 'in Christ.'[1] Schweitzer agrees: "Being in the Spirit is only a form of manifestation of being-in-Christ. Both are descriptions of one and the same state."[2] Neither of these phrases is to be understood in terms of Hellenistic mysticism; they are to be viewed from an eschatological perspective. Knox asserts:

> . . . to be 'in Christ' meant to Paul to stand within that new order of relationships which God brought into being in connection with Jesus and, in some way defying adequate or exact explanation, through the instrumentality of his death and life. To be 'in Christ' was to be an organic part of the 'new creation,' of which the risen Christ was the supreme manifestation and the effective symbol; it was, indeed, to belong to the eschatological kingdom of God which had already appeared within history as the Church.[3]

'Being-in-the-Spirit,' as well as 'being-in-Christ,' is a description of the eschatological state in which the Christian exists. When Paul describes the Christian life as being-in-the-Spirit, he means, as Gunkel says, "the whole life of the Christian is an effect of the Spirit."[4] It means that the Holy Spirit is the power which dominates the total Christian life and sustains the believer in it. Paul's belief that the Christian

---

[1]A. Deissmann, "In Christ Jesus," Die N.T. Formel (Marburg, 1928), p. 84, cited by R. Birch Hoyle, The Holy Spirit in St. Paul (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927), p. 86.

[2]Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 167.

[3]John Knox, Chapters in the Life of Paul (New York: Abingdon Press, 1950), p. 141.

[4]Cited by Hamilton, op. cit., p. 29, Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, p.75.

existence is under domination of the Holy Spirit is shown in his contrasting the new life of the believer with life in the flesh and under the law. The domination of the Spirit replaces the domination of the flesh and law.

Paul's letters contain passages in which flesh and spirit are in opposition to one another. Some scholars attribute these passages to the influence of the Hellenistic religions which held the dualistic belief that matter is inherently evil and thereby in conflict with the spirit which is good.[1] It is true that from the time of Plato there was a tendency to regard the body, because of its materiality, as an intrinsically evil part of man, which was apt to be harmful to the intellectual or moral interest of man.[2] This view was not that of Paul, as his letters clearly show.[3] Three points should be noted. First, for Paul the body is capable of being redeemed, cleansed and sanctified (cf. I Th. 5:23; I Cor. 6:13; II Cor. 4:11; Rom. 8:23; 12:1), and the body, instead of being the prison of the soul, may become the temple of the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 6:19). Second, the end of the redemptive process for Paul is not deliverance from but rather a transformation of the body. "So far from sharing the feeling that is expressed by Plato, Seneca

---

[1]Cf. Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 86; Davies, op. cit., p. 17.

[2]Cf. William L. Davidson, "Dualism (Greek)," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, V (1921), 107-111.

[3]Cf. Craine, op. cit., p. 112; Burton, op. cit., pp. 486-495.

and Plutarch, that true blessedness is achieved only by getting rid of the body Paul retained the feeling, derived from Hebrew ancestry, that the soul could not be wholly happy without a body (cf. I Cor. 15; II Cor. 5; I Th. 5:23; Rom. 8:11)."[1] Third, it was fundamental to Pauline thought that Christ possessed a human or physical body. Davies writes: "To Paul Christ was of the seed of David, a figure in history, a man after the flesh."[2] If the body were intrinsically evil as Hellenistic dualism maintained, it would reduce Paul's faith in the incarnation to an absurdity.

John A. T. Robinson's careful study gives clear insight for understanding Paul's view of the flesh as it is contrasted with the Spirit.[3] The basic meaning of σάρξ (flesh) is flesh-substance which is common to man and beast. However, when Paul uses the term he does not mean simply the fleshy, material body. More specifically, he does not mean any particular part of man, i.e., the body part of man. By σάρξ Paul refers to the whole of man considered from the point of view of his physical existence (Gal. 4:13; II Cor. 12:7; Col. 1:22). Sometimes he uses it to refer to man in general (cf. Gal. 1:16). In other words, Paul uses flesh to refer to the quality of being a human, a creature.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 494; cf. also A. D. Nock, St. Paul (London: Thorton Butterworth, Ltd., 1938), pp. 166f.

[2]Davies, op. cit., p. 18; cf. Rom. 1:3; 9:5.

[3]Cf. John A. T. Robinson, The Body (London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1957), pp. 11-33 for a full treatment. The discussion which follows is largely dependent on this study.

Although flesh is not inherently evil, since it means being human it represents man in his weakness, ineffectiveness, mortality; flesh represents man in contrast to God, or Spirit, in His power. Robinson says: "To have 'conferred with flesh and blood' (Gal. 1:16) would have been for the Apostle to lay himself open to the charge that his gospel was merely human, that it was 'after man' and not 'through revelation' (Gal. 1:11f.; cf. I Cor. 9:8)."[1] In I Cor. 15:43f. we find the same idea: the natural, i.e., fleshly body, is sown in 'weakness'; the spiritual body is raised in 'power.'

In this connection Robinson also points out that Paul does not refer to Man in the flesh as an individual but "as part of a world order. For man over against God is man as a creature, bound up in the bundle of created existence. Hence σάρξ for Paul means man in his 'worldliness,' in the solidarity of earthly existence."[2] Gal. 2:20 refers to "the life that I now live in the flesh." In Philemon 16 we read: "A brother . . . both in the flesh and in the Lord." Paul also uses σάρξ in referring to the solidarity of sex (I Cor. 6:16) and of race (Rom. 9:3). In Rom. 4:1 Paul speaks of Abraham as "our forefather according to the flesh." This usage of flesh carries the connotation, not of evil, but of being limited, external, physical. It is in this sense that it stands in contrast to the Spirit with its connotation of power.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 19. [2] Ibid., p. 21.

For Paul, rather than flesh and spirit being opposed to each other, they represent two contrasting orders or spheres of existence. To be in the flesh was incompatible with being in the Spirit, with being a Christian. Those who live in the sphere of the flesh cannot please God (Rom. 8:8), "for the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God" (Rom. 8:7). No longer are Christians a part of that sphere. In Rom. 7:5 Paul says ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί (when we were in the flesh), as if it were completely a part of the past and had no hold on him in the present as a Christian. A man, in the sphere of the spirit, is no longer controlled by the powers which control the sphere of the flesh.

Clearly, Paul's use of the flesh/spirit conflict is not due to Greek dualism; his use is essentially eschatological. The flesh is the principle of the 'present age'; the Spirit is the principle of the 'age to come.' Because, man, as flesh, is a part of the sphere of the world, he "stands always in a relation of ambiguity to God, since the world to which he is bound in the flesh is a world fallen under sin and death."[1] Man, dominated by the flesh, is in bondage to the powers which are in opposition to God--rulers of this age (I Cor. 2:6,8), the god of this world (II Cor. 4:40), the spirit of this world (I Cor. 2:12), the elemental spirits of the universe (Gal. 4:3). Man, in the sphere of the flesh, is in bondage to the powers of this age; he looks to the world for security and salvation.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 22.

His search continually ends in frustration and further bondage. In contrast, man in the sphere of the Spirit is no longer in bondage to the powers of this age. Christians cannot leave this world while they live out this life. However, because they look to God for security and salvation, believers no longer experience the frustration of non-believers who are subject to the powers which control the world and flesh.

Paul's presentation of his view of the law also reveals the Christian life as characterized by the Spirit. His use of the word νόμος (law) appears to be as inconsistent as his use of flesh. On the one hand, there are passages which speak of the law as expressing the will of God. In Rom. 1:12 we read: "So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good." Also, "It is not the hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified" (Rom. 2:13). On the other hand, in some passages Paul speaks of the law in derogatory terms, referring to it as that which held him captive and from which he is now free. Certainly, no one will be justified by the works of the law (Rom. 3:20). How can one account for this inconsistency in the Apostle's discussion of the law?

The close connection between the law and flesh in Paul's letters gives us the clue. The connection between the two is seen in Phil. 3:4-6 where Paul discusses why he could be confident 'in the flesh.' The reason: as a Pharisee he had kept the law to the very letter. "When Paul asks the Galatians,

'having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected in the flesh?' (Gal. 3:3), he refers, not to a lapse into sensuality, but to a return to reliance upon the law."[1] In Gal. 5:17-18 we see the connection:

> For the desires of the flesh are against the Spirit, and the desires of the Spirit are against the flesh; for these are opposed to each other, to prevent you from doing what you would. But if you are led by the Spirit you arennot under the law.

We are to understand Paul's inconsistent use of the law in the same way that we understand his use of flesh, i.e., in terms of eschatology. The law, like the flesh, is not inherently evil but it belongs to the 'present age.' The Christian lives in the 'age to come,' and the law no longer has any hold on him. Paul condemns the law, because to observe it indicates that a man is depending on man-made standards to measure his status before God. It is a sign of dependence on self, a token of unbelief in the redemptive work of Christ. Paul warns the Galatians against such dependence on the law: "You are severed from Christ, you who would be justified by the law; you have fallen away from grace" (Gal. 5:4).

The relationship, which we found existing between flesh and the Spirit, is also present in regard to the law and the Spirit and has the same eschatological impact. "The written code kills, but the Spirit gives life" (II Cor. 3:6). The eschatological moment is seen in Gal. 3:13-14: "Christ redeemed us from the law . . . that we might receive the promise of the

---

[1]Ibid., p. 25.

Spirit through faith." Those who have the Spirit, the power of the 'age to come,' must not submit to the law which is a part of the 'present age.' "If you are led by the Spirit you are not under the law" (Gal. 3:18). The Spirit-filled Christian does not believe that observing the law insures his salvation. In this sense his connection with the law is severed. In Rom. 7:4-6 we read:

> Likewise, my brethren, you have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God. While we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death. But now we are discharged from the law, dead to that which held us captive, so that we serve not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit.

Through the power of the Spirit the believer is released from the powers which rule the 'present evil age' and the law which governs it. His life is marked with freedom which is a sign of the presence of the Spirit. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom" (II Cor. 3:17).

The Holy Spirit and the Christian Life--Future

We have seen that the Holy Spirit is the power by which man is brought into and sustained in the Christian life. Up to this point, we have concentrated on the passages in which the activity of the Holy Spirit is an expression of the realized, the 'already,' aspect of Paul's eschatology. We shall see that He also plays a crucial role in the futuristic, the 'not yet,' aspect.

In his book Hamilton convincingly shows that, for Paul, the Spirit was oriented toward the future.[1] There are some statements which strictly connect the Holy Spirit with the future state, e.g., Paul associates the Spirit and the resurrection. With this connection the Spirit is necessarily directed to the future. In Rom. 1:4 Jesus' resurrection from the dead is attributed directly to the work of the Spirit. In Rom. 8:11 the general resurrection is also attributed to the Holy Spirit: "If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you." What God, through the Spirit, did for Jesus, He will do for the believer also. There is disagreement among scholars regarding the translation of the word διά. Some scholars think it should be translated with the genitive as 'through' which marks the Spirit as the agent of the future general resurrection.[2] Other scholars prefer to translate διά with the accusative, 'on account of,'[3] which means that the Spirit is not only the power which initiates the resurrection but also sustains the life of

---

[1]Hamilton, op. cit., pp. 17-40; cf. also Geerhardus Vos, "The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit," Biblical and Theological Studies (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), pp. 211-259.

[2]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 18 prefers this interpretation.

[3]Ibid., p. 18, Gaugler, Michel, Schlatter, Cullmann, Sanday and Headlam are cited.

the redeemed in the resurrected state.[1] In either case the activity of the Spirit is oriented toward the future.

Paul's idea of the present sonship of the believer, which, as we saw, he attributes to the work of the Spirit (cf. Gal. 4:6), also relates the Spirit to the future. In Rom. 8:15-17 the futuristic eschatological aspect, the 'not yet,' of sonship appears. Hamilton writes:

> The status of sonship relates believers to God as His children (τέκνα θεοῦ, v.16) and the right of inheritance follows. Believers are also heirs of God (κληρονόμοι . . . θεοῦ, v.17). . . . Because heirs of God are fellow heirs of Christ (συγκληρονόμαι . . . χριστοῦ, v.17) they will receive what He received, i.e. they will be glorified with Him (συνδοξασθῶμεν, v.17) will have the future glory (μέλλουσαν δόξαν) revealed in them as it has already been revealed in Christ (v.18).[2]

Rom. 8:18-22 describes Paul's eschatological expectation in terms of creation. In v.23 he returns to what Hamilton sees as a summary of the whole preceding section of Rom. 8, i.e., Paul returns to the future aspect of the Holy Spirit. He refers to the possession of the Spirit in the present as the ἀπαρχήν (the 'first-fruits'), which, as we shall see, implies that more of the same is expected. At some future time a complete, rather than a partial, action will be experienced. In regard to sonship believers ἀπεκδεχόμενοι (await eagerly) for adoption. Paul places τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος (redemption of the body) in apposition to adoption as sons as if to further define it. "The future redemption of the body is the 'not-yet-fulfilled,' the future aspect of sonship which the Spirit will

---

[1]Vos, op. cit., p. 226. [2]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 32.

fulfil."[1] In the case of sonship, it is clear, the Spirit's action is begun in the present, the already, but the completed work is still outstanding.[2]

Paul uses two words in connection with the Holy Spirit which make clear the tension of the 'already' and 'not yet.' The two words are ἀρραβών , the payment made in pledge, and ἀπαρχή , firstfruits. ἀρραβών is a Semitic loan word from the root word which means to give or take in pledge.[3] In the Septuagint ἀρραβών is simply a transliteration into Greek of the Hebrew word which is found in the story of Judah and Tamar. In return for Tamar's favors, Judah promised her a kid from the flock, and until he should send it, he gave her an ἀρραβών , a pledge, consisting of his signet, cord and staff (Gen. 38:17-18). At the time of Paul ἀρραβών was used to designate earnest money in business transactions, "a payment which obligates the contracting party to make further payments."[4] In modern parlance it would be termed a 'down payment' or 'first installment.' This is Paul's meaning in II Cor. 5:5 when he says that God

---

[1]Ibid., p. 32.

[2]Ibid., pp. 33-39; Hamilton illustrates this tension between the 'already' and the 'not-yet' in Paul's presentation of faith, hope, love, prayer and glorification.

[3]Cf. Barnabas Ahern, "The Indwelling Spirit, Pledge of our Inheritance (Eph. 1:14)," Catholic Biblical Quarterly ix (1947), pp. 179-189.

[4]Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, & F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), p. 109.

"has given us the Spirit as an ἀρραβών (a guarantee) of the heavenly body of the future state. In II Cor. L:22 he uses ἀρραβών to show that the presence of the Spirit is a guarantee that God's promises will be fulfilled.

ἀπαρχή (first-fruits) carries the same idea. In Hebrew terms it referred to the first-fruits of any kind which man offered to God (Deut. 18:4; 26:2,10; Num. 18:8-12) and were consecrated (Num. 5:9).[1] It is the first of more which is to come. Paul uses it the same way. The resurrected Christ is the "first fruits of those who have fallen asleep." Christ is the first; others will follow (cf. I Cor. 15:20,23). In Rom. 8:23 the ἀπαρχή of the Spirit is the gift of God to man (cf. II Cor. 5:5). It signifies only the beginning of the full fruition of God's blessings which will follow at the consummation.

Hamilton includes the observations of other scholars who agree that Paul's use of ἀπαρχή and ἀρραβών brings the futuristic aspect of the Spirit into focus. Cullmann states:

> We have seen the Spirit is an element of the future aeon, the matter out of which the new creation of God's kingdom will consist internally as well as externally. The constituent part of the future Kingdom of God is already there in the Church, only, however, as a 'down payment' (ἀρραβών, II Cor. 1:22).[2]

And again:

> Paul draws emphatic attention to the fact that the Spirit presents the piece of the future that has now already

---

[1]Ibid., p. 80.

[2]Cited by Hamilton, op. cit., p. 20, Oscar Cullman, Koenigherrschaft Christi und Kirche im Neuen Testament, p. 23.

> become present when he designates it as 'first-fruits' (ἀπαρχή, Rom. 8:23) and as 'down payment' (ἀρραβών II Cor. 1:22).[1]

Barrett expresses the same idea:

> For Paul also, the gift of the Spirit meant both the realization of eschatology and a reaffirmation of it; so much is implied by his use of the term ἀρραβών; the present possession of the Spirit means that part of the future bliss is already attained, and equally that part still remains future, still unpossessed.[2]

Eduard Schweizer writes:

> If the decisive event is on the one hand the resurrection of Jesus and on the other hand the resurrection of the believers, then the Spirit must be understood, as in the early Church, as a sign for what is still to come. Since the event of Jesus' resurrection, the resurrection at the end of the times is no longer an indefinite hope; the reality of the present Spirit guarantees the reality of what is to come. Thus, can Paul designate the πνεῦμα as ἀπαρχή for the still to be expected redemption of the body (Rom. 8:23) or as ἀρραβών for the new 'house' which waits for us (II Cor. 5:5; 1:22).[3]

Hamilton concludes with a remark by Gunkel: "The Spirit is the preliminary payment, which ought to be a guarantee for the future, complete payment, which is still outstanding (II Cor. 1:22; 5:5; cf. Eph. 1:14).[4]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 20.

[2]Cited by Hamilton, op. cit., p. 20, C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and Gospel Tradition, p. 153.

[3]Cited by Hamilton, op. cit., p. 21, Eduard Schweizer, "πνεῦμα," III, 1,d.

[4]Cited by Hamilton, op. cit., p. 21, Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, p. 63.

The Holy Spirit and the Christian Life--Ethical Norm

It is clear in Paul's doctrine of the Holy Spirit we are confronted with the eschatological tension of the 'already' and the 'not-yet.' On the one hand the Spirit belongs to the future, to the not-yet fulfilled, to the realm of hope and promise. On the other hand the Spirit is present now. The fullness, the completion lies in the future, but everything which is a part of the not-yet fulfilled is partially and proleptically realized in the present. The believer lives in the midst of the 'already' and the 'not-yet,' in the in-between times. In this tension Paul's concept of the Spirit takes on an ethical dimension. Not only is the Spirit the power by which a man is brought into and sustained in the Christian life and the basis of his hope for the future consummation, He is also the ground of Paul's ethical exhortation. The Apostle announces that the believer lives by the Spirit, he also admonishes him to walk by the Spirit (Gal. 5:25). We saw that, for Paul, the Spirit was the power which lies behind the indicative of this statement, it remains for us to explore the function of the Holy Spirit in regard to the imperative aspect.

How is Paul justified in making such a strong exhortation in the light of his positive indicative statement? He is justified in his exhortation, because the believer lives in the in-between times. He is subject to two sets of powers, the powers of the 'present evil age' and those of the 'age to come.' As we saw, when a man becomes a Christian and a citizen of the

'age to come,' he breaks with the 'present age.' He is in-the-Spirit, in-Christ; he is not subject to the powers of the flesh, nor to the governance of the law. The act of baptism, the believer's overt initiation into the Christian life, signifies death to the old life and a rising to new life.[1] "By baptism, the Christian man through faith had died, had risen, had been justified; he was a new creation who had already passed from death to life, for whom the final judgment of God himself was past."[2] This being true why did Paul see any need for exhortation? The fact is, and this is the dilemma of the believer, he has not been removed from this world. He still lives in the world, and its powers, although they have received a death blow, still exercise a threat. The believer is still open to the attacks of sin. "Therefore he who thinks to stand let him beware let he fall" (I Cor. 10:12). "A Christian's existence is not magically transformed but even after he becomes a Christian his life continues to be an historical existence as long as he is 'in the flesh'."[3] He is still temporarily surrounded by the evil age, waiting for the complete revelation of God's glory when all sin and death will be annihilated. Until that time comes he must struggle with the question of Christian

---

[1]Cf. Tannehill, op. cit., for a thorough treatment of this concept in Paul's letters.

[2]W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), p. 342.

[3]Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 258.

behavior. Paul saw this clearly and his exhortations, his imperatives, firmly anchored in the fact of God's grace,[1] manifested supremely in Jesus Christ, are justified, yes, even essential.

It must be understood that when Paul speaks of keeping commandments and rules (cf. I Th. 4:1; II Th. 3:4; Philemon 8; I Cor. 7:19; Gal. 6:16), he is not referring to justification, i.e., observing rules or commandments in order to achieve salvation. On the contrary, salvation was the work of Jesus Christ. The Spirit is a witness to the fact of God's saving act in Jesus Christ (Rom. 7:4; 10:4; Gal. 5:1). Since the coming of Christ the law as a way of salvation is no longer valid (Rom. 6:14; 7:1ff.; Gal. 2:19; 3:13,24f., 4:5). Through faith man is the beneficiary of Christ's redemptive work. All of Paul's statements regarding justification by faith, rather than law, can be brought to bear on this point. The work of the Christian life does not earn justification; God's grace in Christ is the only way to salvation (Rom. 3:24). Paul does not mean that the old law is to be substituted by his commands, his rules, even Christ's rule, as a way to salvation. No rule, no law, no observance of any standard, can accomplish justification. Schrage writes: "Der Gehorsam verdient nicht die Gnade, sondern setzt sie voraus; er begrundet sie nicht, sondern folgt aus ihr."[2]

---

[1]For treatments of Paul's rooting the imperative in the indicative cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, trans. J. Holland-Smith and W. J. O'Hara (New York: Herder & Herder, 1965), pp. 268-277; Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 332-333; Davies, Setting. . . ., pp. 342-346.

[2]Wolfgang Schrage, Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paranese (Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1961), p. 95.

The Christian has been transferred from the order or realm which depends on observing the law as a means of salvation into the realm of the Spirit. Having moved into this sphere, a Christian must, says Paul, walk in accordance with the Spirit. A Christian must live a life which is worthy of his calling (I Th. 2:12). This imperative must always be seen against the background that, for Paul, the Spirit is the power of the future age. To walk in the Spirit means to walk in the way of the future age. Paul's use of ἀρραβών and ἀπαρχή makes this clear. As we saw, Paul speaks of the Spirit as a guarantee of that which is to come, a beginning of that which is to follow. It is a down payment or preliminary installment of what will be received in fullness at some future time. At this point we want to emphasize the idea that it is the sameness of that which is experienced in part now with what will be experienced in full in the future. The walk in the Spirit now is the same as the walk in the consummated life then.

Paul's connection of the Spirit and the Kingdom of God (Rom. 14:17) also emphasizes the sameness of life in the Spirit now with that of the future age. Hamilton shows that the association of the Spirit with the Kingdom relates the Spirit to the future, because "with him (Paul) it is clear that the Kingdom of God is still outstanding. It is the sphere of the future blessings of redemption."[1] One must agree with Hamilton

---

[1]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 227.

regarding the future character of the two. However, we should like to start "from the eschatological end of the line and look backward from this into the present life."[1] It should be noted that in Rom. 14:17 Paul speaks of the Kingdom, although it is still to be realized fully, in terms of the present life of Christians in this world. He describes "the kind of life which is to be lived by those who have submitted to the rule of God. . . ."[2] The Apostle says: "οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (For the kingdom of God does not mean food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit)." Righteousness and peace and joy are characteristic of the Kingdom of God; they are available now in the Holy Spirit. "This means that the Spirit is the vital principle of the kingdom which produces the effects in human life (in the present) that are appropriate to the future life in the kingdom (of the future."[3] The future age has broken into the present in the action of the Spirit. The same power of the future kingdom is present and available now in the Spirit. In other words, to walk in the Spirit is to walk in accordance with the future life in the kingdom. The demand is not simply demand, it is also gospel.

---

[1]Vos, op. cit., p. 227.

[2]O. E. Evans, "Kingdom of God," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 25.

[3]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 22, parenthesis mine.

What is the nature of the 'walk in the Spirit'? Does Paul mean that a Christian simply acts spontaneously in any situation in response to the promptings of the Spirit who dwells within him? Wahlstrom advocates this view. He writes:

> The factor which makes the Christian free and able 'to will and to do' is the indwelling Spirit. . . . The Spirit is in no way felt as a restraint, for the will of the Christian is in perfect accord with the will of the Spirit. It is this 'spirit-person' who is 'autonomous,' a law unto himself.[1]

The same idea is found in his discussion of the indwelling Christ:

> If we ask how this indwelling Christ operates in the Christian's moral life, we would have to answer simply that the Christian, by virtue of the indwelling Christ, knows of himself what is right and proper. Even when he comes into situations which never arose in the life of Jesus on earth, or in the life of his disciples, and in regard to which, therefore, no word or example of the Master can be found, the Christian is able to decide for himself what his course of action should be. He is 'Christ-autonomous,' or, in a phrase more familiar to us he is 'the man in Christ.' The freedom of the Christian in his spiritual and moral life is 'in the Spirit,' or 'in Christ.'[2]

Enslin agrees with Wahlstrom on this point. Writing about the standards of the Christian life he says: "For Paul . . . the final authority was the light within."[3] And again: "He who was in Christ would have supplied by the Spirit all necessary insight and help."[4]

---

[1]Eric H. Wahlstrom, The New Life in Christ (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950), p. 148; cf. also pp. 192, 195.

[2]Ibid., p. 152.

[3]Morton Scott Enslin, The Ethics of Paul (New York: Harper & Bros., 1930), p. 139.

[4]Ibid., p. 119.

It cannot be denied that there are passages in the Pauline writings which would serve as a legitimate basis for the view of Wahlstrom and Enslin. A case in point is Gal. 5:16-25 in which, as Davies points out, "A contrast is drawn between the works of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit, the implication being that the Christian life has the character of spontaneity."[1] The same idea is expressed in I Cor. 2:12-16 where the natural man is contrasted with the spiritual man. Because of the possession of the Spirit a believer has ability to interpret spiritual truth which is denied to the non-believer. The spiritual can judge but is not subject to judgment. Also "the Spirit apparently of itself assures to the Christian the possession of the mind of Christ, an illumination which is autonomous."[2]

Taken alone these passages do indicate that Paul believed the indwelling Spirit and the indwelling Christ insured Christian behavior. However, two factors in Paul's writings make it impossible to accept this view. The first is Paul's emphasis on recompense. Filson concludes after his study of Paul's conception of recompense: "it can be said that without denying the all-inclusive scope of the operation of grace in the Christian life, Paul stressed responsibility and accountability, and assured believers that worthy living would be rewarded."[3] Davies refers to this aspect of Paul's thought as

---

[1]Davies, Setting. . . ., p. 347. [2]Ibid., p. 347.

[3]Floyd V. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense (Leipzig: J. D. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1931), p. 115.

'vigilatory.' Under this heading he places three concepts which are found in Paul's letters:

> (a) The idea that, however much the justification which he has already experienced anticipates it or may be regarded as 'final' in principle, the Christian still awaits a judgement yet to come, the last judgement.
> (b) The idea that at this last judgement each will be rewarded, not according to his faith, but according to his works.
> (c) The idea that in preparation for this final judgement obedience to the will of God is necessary, so that the Christian life turns out to be an ἄσκησις and a call to vigilance.[1]

A second factor which makes the position of Wahlstrom and Enslin untenable is the preponderance of exhortatory material in the letters of the Apostle. There are large blocks of hortatory material in his letters, e.g., Rom. 12:1-15:13; Gal. 5:13-6:10; Col. 3:5-4:6; I Th. 4:1-5:22; I Cor. 4-11. Gal. 6:1-10 and I Cor. 6:1-6, in particular, show that community discipline became a problem among the Christians very early. In other cases no specific motivation is evident to account for the presence of these hortatory teachings. We are to assume that Paul gave them to be used as they were needed, i.e., as the occasion arose. In the highest sense these teachings define and make explicit the will of God for man. The Christian has entered a new sphere, a new life, and Paul spells out in no uncertain terms what this existence in the new sphere means in terms of his daily life.

In his hortatory passages Paul confronts readers with the absolute ethical requirements of God upon those who have

---

[1]Davies, Setting. . . . , p. 347.

been called to be Christians. He did not assume that the indwelling Spirit meant automatic behavior in accordance with the will of God. The Holy Spirit in the Christian does not make exhortation superfluous. This becomes clear from the context of I Cor. 6:19: "Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God." This verse appears immediately after Paul's warnings about immorality and precedes his exhortation about marriage. Even though the Spirit dwells within the believer, Paul sees the necessity for concrete commandments (cf. I Cor. 3:16).

The same kind of argument applies to Paul's concept that the believer is 'in-Christ.' In discussing this idea and that of the indwelling Christ Wahlstrom asserts: "The Christ who dwells within might be considered an inward monitor who guides and directs the actions of the Christian." In regard to I Cor. 6:12ff. he writes: "The argument here is not that the indwelling Christ is a standard, but that their bodies are the temple of God and members of the body of Christ. The very nature of their new status makes it incongruous for them to practice fornication."[1] Enslin takes the same position. He says: "By identifying himself with Christ he (the Christian) became, by virtue of this union, as Christ was, and could do and did what Christ did. . . ."[2] In a later passage he expresses the same idea but more emphatically denies any external guidance:

---

[1]Wahlstrom, op. cit., p. 151. [2]Enslin, op. cit., p. 125.

"To the man in Christ social duties were no longer due to external commands--he was free from them--but due to the constraining love of Christ which resulted from identification of self and purpose with him."[1]

Schrage refutes Wahlstrom and Enslin with the reminder that Paul's idea of the unity of the believer with Christ is not a matter of identity. The Apostle's thinking is not that of the mystery religions; he never identifies himself nor the Christian with Christ.[2] Schrage points out that Paul's 'in-Christ' formula is not a mystical but, an eschatological one, as we saw, and an ecclesiological one.[3] By baptism the believer is embodied into the body of Christ, by which Paul means the Church (cf. I Cor. 12). There is nothing in the Pauline letters to indicate that being-in-Christ meant being free from following commandments and rules. Paul admonishes those who are 'in-Christ.' In I Cor. 4:17 he speaks of sending Timothy to remind the Corinthians "of my way in Christ, as I teach them everywhere in every church." Many passages speak of specific commandments or rules for those who believe, who are in-Christ (cf. Col. 3:18-20; I Th. 4:1; II Th. 3:4; II Cor. 5:17; I Cor. 7:19; Gal. 6:5).

It is evident that Paul would not have agreed with Wahlstrom's statement: "The ultimate and absolute standard for the Christian life is the new Spiritual life itself."[4]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 232. [2]Schrage, op. cit., p. 80.

[3]Ibid., p. 81. [4]Wahlstrom, op. cit., p. 145.

Paul's emphasis on preparation for the final judgment and his exhortations show the limits of such a norm. Paul saw the necessity for going beyond this and stating concrete admonishments for particular situations. Schrage asserts: "Die Grenzen dieser Norm zeigen sich aber schon darin, dass die paulinishen Mahnungen mit dem Inhalt jener Entsprechungsverhältnisse nicht kongruent sind und in der Konkretion darüber hinausgehen."[1] The Christian life necessitates some guidelines. 'Become what you are' is not adequate as a concrete norm for the Christian way.

From this discussion it would seem as though we are denying earlier statements that the new life of the Christian is empowered by the Spirit. On the contrary, we are refuting the view which holds that the invasion of the Spirit in the life of the believer means automatic knowledge of Christian behavior and the power to follow it. The Christian way requires definite direction. For Paul this direction is also provided by the Spirit. Not only is the Spirit the drive and power of the Christian life, He also points the direction.

That Paul saw the Spirit not only as the power of the Christian life but also as its norm and guide is seen in these passages where believers are admonished "to walk according to the Spirit," e.g., Rom. 8:4 περιπατοῦσιν . . . κατὰ πνεῦμα, (walk by the Spirit), e.g., Gal. 5:16 πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε; Gal. 5:25 πνεύματι . . . στοιχῶμεν. Those passages which use κατα with the accusative clearly point to the Spirit as the

---

[1]Schrage, op. cit., p. 82.

norm of the Christian life, e.g., Rom. 8:4f. says not only, "dass die vom Gesetz der Sünde und des Todes Befreiten 'unter der Gewalt' des Geistes ihr Leben fuhren," but also "'in der Richtung,' 'nach der Norm' des Geistes."[1] It is particularly evident in Gal. 5:25 in which Paul places both power and norm in juxtaposition. In this verse "the conduct of life is measured by the source of redemptive life, i.e., the Spirit."[2] According to Stamm, περιπατεῖτε , which Paul uses in 5:16, is a "favorite biblical metaphor to describe the whole course of man's life."[3] It stresses the outward conduct. In 5:25 Paul uses another word for walk, i.e., στοιχῶμεν , whose appropriate translation, according to Burton, is "to walk (in a straight line), to conduct one's self rightly."[4] It contains the idea of a norm or standard. Hamilton contends that Gal. 5:18 expresses the same idea, i.e., the Spirit is both the source of the Christian life and the norm of conduct, by means of the phrase πνεύματι ἄγεσθε (led by the Spirit).[5]

From all these texts it is evident that, for Paul, the Spirit has, as Schrage terms it, "eigentümlichen Doppelheit,"[6] because it designates the foundation and strength which is

---

[1]Schrage, op. cit., p. 74; cf. also fn. 17 on same page.

[2]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 30.

[3]Raymond T. Stamm, "The Epistle of Galatians, Introduction and Exegesis," Interpreter's Bible, Vol. X, ed. George A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953), 560.

[4]Burton, op. cit., p. 322.

[5]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 30.

[6]Schrage, op. cit., p. 74.

given to the Christian as well as the norm and the guide of his new life. Schrage gives a valid warning that, in order to avoid moralistic misunderstandings, it must be constantly kept in mind, "dass . . . der Wandel nach der Norm des Geistes nur möglich ist aus der Kraft des Geistes."[1] The Spirit never ceases being the gift of God; it is never to be considered a property of man.

Having established that the Spirit is norm and the guide of the Christian life, the question remains: What is the nature of the Spirit norm? What does it mean to walk according to the Spirit, to be led by the Spirit, to conduct one's life according to the standard of the Spirit? We noted that Paul uses three verbs in Gal. 5:16-25 to describe the new life in the Spirit. He also terms the results of the Christian life as being the 'fruit of the Spirit' to denote the result of life in the Spirit. All of this Paul summarizes in verse 18 as freedom from the law. "If you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law (οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον)." However, after Paul's admonition to walk by the Spirit in verse 25 he procedes to show that this command is carried out by fulfilling the law of Christ. When Paul says in verse 18 that believers are not subject to the law he means, as we saw, that they are free from the law in the sense that observing the law will bring salvation. The believer has been transferred to the sphere of the Spirit, in which the Spirit is the norm. Now he must πνεύματι στοιχῶμεν (walk

---

[1]Ibid., p. 74.

according to the Spirit), according to the power of the future age.

Gal. 5:25 serves as a conclusion to the preceding section and, as Bonnard says, a springboard to the new development which follows.[1] The exhortations which follow are based on the established fact of the Spirit. "L'Esprit donne au croyant la permission de vivre, en l'assurant de sa justification gratuite en Jesus-Christ."[2] Now, the believer is free to live his life in total dependence on God. The Spirit has given the possibility of life and new conduct. Burton remarks:

> that Paul should exhort men who live by the Spirit to do the things which it is the very nature of the Spirit to produce (cf. vss. 22ff.) is not uncharacteristic of the Apostle who constantly combines the conception of morality as the product of a divine force working in men with the thought of the human will as a necessary force in producing it.[3]

Embedded in the hortatory section which follows Gal. 5:25 we find the phrase "fulfill the law of Christ." This is a difficult phrase and has been interpreted in various ways. Because it is found in the midst of moral injunctions, Dodd says "it would seem, the Law of Christ is such that it can be stated in the form of a code or precepts to which a Christian man is obliged to conform."[4] Dodd attempts to prove his point

---

[1]Pierre Bonnard, "L'Epitre de Saint Paul aux Galates," Commentaire du Noveau Testament, Vol. IX (Paris: Delachaux & Niestle' S.A., 1953), p. 116.

[2]Ibid., p. 116. [3]Burton, op. cit., p. 322.

[4]C. H. Dodd, "ἔννομος χριστοῦ," Studia Paulina (Haarlem: de Erven F. Bohn N. V., 1953), p. 100.

by showing that the law of the Spirit and the law of Christ are not parallel expressions. We shall attempt to follow his argument.

The phrase 'law of the Spirit' does not appear in Paul's writings. In Rom. 8:2 we read: ὁ γάρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσέν με (for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus freed me). For Dodd, the connection between πνεῦμα and ζωή in this passage brings to mind ζῶμεν πνεύματι (we live by the Spirit) of Gal. 5:25. In the Galatian passage 'to live by the Spirit' is 'to live in freedom'; similarly in the Roman passage the 'law of the Spirit' has set men free (cf. II Cor. 3:17).

> In Galatians such liberty is the condition under which Christians are 'to serve one another in love' (Gal. 5:13), or, in other words, to 'fulfil the law of Christ' (Gal. 6:2). This is to 'walk by the Spirit,' and 'walking by the Spirit' (norm) is distinguishable from 'living by the Spirit' (power). As we saw the two are not identical; the former is the consequence of the latter (Gal. 5:25).[1]

To carry out the analogy, it is likely that 'the law of the Spirit' of Rom. 8:2 is thought of as the regulative principle[2] which brings about the condition of liberty under which it is possible for the believer to conduct his life according to the norm of the Spirit, πνεύματι στοιχῶμεν.[3] Concluding that the the 'law of the Spirit' and the 'law of Christ' cannot be taken as parallel expression, Dodd says: "ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος

---

[1] Ibid., p. 102, parenthesis mine.

[2] Cf. Davies, Setting. . . ., p. 360.

[3] Rom. 8:14 and Gal. 5:18 use the expression 'πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται,' (led by the Spirit of God).

τῆς ζωῆς corresponds to πνεύματι ζῶμεν and ὁ νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ corresponds to πνεύματι στοιχῶμεν."[1]

Up to this point Dodd's argument is acceptable, but it is not clear why the distinction between the Spirit as the power of the Christian life and the Spirit as the norm of the Christian life, which does correspond to the 'law of Christ,' necessitates the reduction of the Spirit as a norm and the 'law of Christ' to a particular set of moral injunctions. Clearly this is Dodd's intention for he says: "It follows that we are not obliged by the emphasis laid upon the doctrine of the Spirit in the immediate context, to interpret the νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ of Gal. 6:2 in a sense which excludes the prima facie suggestion of a 'law' in some sort analogous to the Torah.[2]

Dodd substantiates this conclusion by setting forth the evidence in the Pauline letters that their author appealed to precepts of Christ, e.g., I Cor. 9:14; I Cor. 7:10-11. In addition to these two specific references to precepts attributed to 'the Lord,' there are numerous passages which are reminiscent of the words of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels.[3] Dodd concludes:

> Certainly it would be a mistake to attempt to confine the connotation of ὁ νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ to the comparatively restricted body of traditional Sayings of Jesus, but it appears that even for Paul, with his strong sense of the immediate governance of Christ through His Spirit

---

[1]Dodd, "ἔννομος χριστοῦ," p. 103.

[2]Ibid., p. 103.

[3]Ibid., pp. 106-108; cf. also Davies, Paul. . . ., pp. 135-142 for an exhaustive treatment of this material.

> in the Church, that which the Lord commanded and 'ordained' remains the solid, historical and creative nucleus of the whole.[1]

Although Dodd does not strictly limit the νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ to a particular group of precepts, he comes very close. Davies goes beyond Dodd at this point. After his study of the Pauline passages which indicate dependence on the words of Jesus, he concludes: "When he (Paul) uses the phrase νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ he meant that the actual words of Jesus were for him a new Torah." And again: "We have seen . . . that we can accept Paul's use νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ quite simply as a description of the New Torah that Jesus supplied in His words."[2] Davies draws back from this view somewhat in a later work. He says that Paul had access to a tradition of the words of Jesus. "This he had 'received' and this he 'transmitted': to this whenever necessary and possible, he appealed as authoritative, so that this tradition constituted part of the 'law of Christ'."[3]

The arguments of Dodd and Davies that Paul had access to a tradition of the teachings of Jesus, which he considered to be authoritative,[4] are convincing. However, we must take issue with the idea of restricting νόμος τοῦ χριστοῦ to the words, or a particular set of teachings, of Jesus. Apparently, Davies,

---

[1]Dodd, "ἔννόμος χριστοῦ," p. 110.

[2]Davies, Paul. . . ., p. 144.

[3]Davies, Setting. . . ., p. 366, underlining mine.

[4]The whole issue is related to the larger problem of the 'quest of the historical Jesus.' Cf. Davies, Setting. . . ., p. 349; James M. Robinson, A New Quest of the Historical Jesus (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959); J. D. McCaughey, "Question of the Historical Jesus," The Reformed Theological Review, XX (1961), 1-12.

himself, is unwilling to accept such a limited view, because, in the chapter following his identification of the law with the actual words of Jesus, he writes:

> . . . not only did the words of Jesus form a Torah for Paul, but so also did the person of Jesus. In a real sense conformity to Christ, His teaching and His life, has taken the place for Paul of conformity to the Jewish Torah. Jesus Himself--in word and deed or fact is a New Torah.[1]

Dodd would seem to agree when he cites Rom. 13:14 and says: ". . . the moral ideal he (Paul) has set forth is that embodied in the character of Jesus."[2]

In discussing the 'law of Christ' and its relation to its hortatory context in Galatians 6:1-10, Bonnard has rightly pointed out: "Ce n'est pas que ces versets, dans la pensee de l'apôtre fait plus et mieux que de rappeler une parole ou un enseignement de Jesus; elle applique aux Galates cette loi du Christ en leur montrant ce qu'elle signifie pour eux, au moment ou il leur écrit."[3] Clearly, for Paul the law of Christ must be identified with the all inclusive principle, or the law, of love. Although Paul does not explicitly identify the 'law of Christ' with the 'law of Love' in this context, there is no doubt that the law of love is the law of his Christian life. Taking up the demand of Christ in Gal. 5:13, he says, "For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, 'You shall love your neighbor as

---

[1]Davies, Paul. . . ., p. 148.

[2]C. H. Dodd, History and the Gospel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938), p. 66.

[3]Bonnard, op. cit., p. 117.

yourself" (cf. I Cor. 16:14, Rom. 13:10). If we approach this issue from the perspective of the injunction πνεύματι στοιχῶμεν we also find that it is essentially an admonition to love, because, in Pauline writings, the two concepts (Spirit and love) are inseparable. "The Spirit is the fulfillment of the intention of God's law (Rom. 8:40) and therefore binds us to the law of love."[1] The idea that love is the work of the Spirit is found in Gal. 5:22. In this verse Paul enumerates the 'fruit of the Spirit,' and love stands first. It "stands in a sense in a class by itself, and is probably thought of as the source from which all the rest flow."[2] In I Cor. 12-14 love is set over every other spiritual gift. According to Rom. 5:5 God is the author of love and the Spirit is the agent through whom that love is poured in our hearts. ". . . and hope does not disappoint us, because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given us." In Rom. 15:30 Paul makes his appeal to unity διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος (through our Lord Jesus Christ and through the love of the Spirit). According to Col. 7:8 Epaphras makes known to Paul the congregation's love in the Spirit. All these texts show the close relationship between love and the Spirit in Paul's thinking. It does not seem too much to say that, for the Apostle, to walk according to the Spirit meant to walk according to the way of love (cf. Rom. 14:13-20).

---

[1]Beker, op. cit., p. 15. [2]Burton, op. cit., p. 314.

It is also clear from Paul's writings that what it meant to walk by the Spirit, according to the law of Christ, is disclosed by Christ Himself whose life, his work and words were ἀγάπη .[1] Schrage writes: ". . . für Agape in I Kor. 13 eigentlich 'Christus selbst' stehen könnte und er, und nicht der Christ oder der ideale Christ, das Subjeckt der Sätze I Kor. 13."[2] This love was manifested supremely in the Cross. In the phrase of Anders Nygren, the love of the Spirit is the "Agape of the Cross."[3] Dodd sees the profound connection between the Cross, ἀγάπη , and the Spirit. He writes:

> While Paul's reflection upon the saving facts of the death and resurrection of Christ leads him to the love of God as the supreme principle exhibited in these facts, it is his reflection upon the Spirit and the charismata or gifts of the Spirit in the Church that leads him to love or charity as at once the greatest of the charismata --'the love of God shed abroad to us (Rom. 5:5)--and the root principle of all morality. The true supernatural life, now brought into being by Christ, is the life distinguished by the 'fruits of the Spirit' as described in Gal. 5:22, and exhibiting the dispositions set forth in the hymn of charity in I Cor. 13.[4]

What it means to live according to the law of Christ and to walk according to the Spirit is disclosed in the life of Christ, and can be summarized by the commandment of love.

---

[1]Cf. Donald J. Selby, Toward the Understanding of St. Paul (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), p. 304. He says: "Most of Paul's allusions to the life of Jesus appeal to his example for Christian living."

[2]Schrage, op. cit., p. 250.

[3]Anders Nygren, Agape and Eros, trans. Philip S. Watson (London: S. P. C. K., 1953), p. 117.

[4]Dodd, Apostolic. . . ., pp. 126 f.; cf. C. A. A. Scott, "What Happened at Pentecost," The Spirit, ed. B. H. Streeter (New York: MacMillan Co., 1919), pp. 126 f.

For Paul the all inclusive principle or the norm of the Christian life is the law of love. The norm for the action is love, but it must be spelled out in concrete acts. The phrase, 'the law of Christ,' lies in the midst of moral injunctions (Gal. 6:2) as does the phrase 'walking in love' (Rom. 14:15; cf. Gal. 5:13; Rom. 13:10). Schrage says: ". . . die Liebe stellt den Christen jeweils neu auch in einmalige und wiederholbare Situationen, genauer: in die geschichtliche Begegnung mit dem Nächsten, und hier entscheidet sich dann auch das konkrete Verhalten."[1] In interpreting the law of love for particular situations, sometimes Paul relied on the words of Jesus; sometimes he gave his own interpretation. The point is: in the time of Paul, and throughout the history of the church, the law of love has required interpretation in concrete terms for particular situations. As we shall argue in the last chapter, for Paul, one of the primary functions of the prophet was the interpretation of the law.

---

[1]Schrage, op. cit., p. 267.

CHAPTER IV

PAUL AS A PROPHET

Although Paul does not specifically claim in his writings to be a prophet or to possess prophetic powers, his letters indicate that he conceived of himself as a prophet. As we noted in the first chapter, one of the arguments frequently used by scholars to prove Paul's strong sense of apostleship is that he refers to his apostolic role in prophetic terms.[1] We must consider the question of the significance of Paul's frequent use of Old Testament appellations and attributes in discussing his apostolic role. Why did he use Old Testament prophetic terms in defending his authority as an apostle? In this chapter, after setting forth the material which indicates that Paul thought of his apostolic role in prophetic terms, we shall attempt to show that he is not simply using these terms to prove that he is a true apostle. He selects them, because he believes that, as an apostle of Jesus Christ, he has a particular task to perform, and prophetic terms are indicative of the nature of his peculiar apostolic work. We shall try to see what Paul considers his particular apostolic function is and why prophetic terms are appropriate expressions of it.

---

[1] Supra, p. 16 for specific references.

This should give us insight not only into Paul's understanding of his apostleship but also a clearer idea of his concept of the Christian prophet and prophetic word.

Prophetic Aspects of Paul's Apostleship

A Man Called by God

One of the conspicuous traits of the Old Testament prophet is his awareness of having received a particular call to do a specific task. A concise statement of prophetic consciousness is given by H. Wheeler Robinson who writes: "The cardinal fact of prophetic consciousness, as it is displayed in Amos and his great successors, is the absolute conviction of a divine call, mission, and message."[1] Rowley agrees: "The prophet is not one who elects to prophesy, but one who is inescapably constrained to prophesy . . . we are given an account of the call of so many of the prophets who are unmistakably set forth as true prophets that we are justified in finding the call to be an essential of true prophecy."[2]

Clearly Paul saw himself as one who has been called by God. It must be pointed out that the New Testament word καλεῖν (to call) is a technical term for the process of salvation.[3]

---

[1]H. Wheeler Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), p. 113.

[2]H. H. Rowley, The Rediscovery of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), p. 143.

[3]K. L. Schmidt, "καλέω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. and ed., Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed. Gerhard Kittel, III (1965), 487-496.

Paul frequently uses καλειν as an appellation for Christians: κλητοί Ἰησοῦ (called of Jesus Christ), Rom. 1:6; κλητοῖς ἁγιοῖς (called saints), Rom. 1:7; I Cor. 1:2. In Rom. 8:28 he speaks of the τοῖς κατά πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς (the ones called according to the purpose) of God. In I Cor. 1:24 Paul refers to believing Jews and Gentiles in contrast to non-believers as τοῖς κλητοῖς (ones called). If κλητός is applicable for all Christians it should not be surprising that Paul also refers to himself as 'called.' However, for our study, the juxtaposition of κλητός and απόστολος (apostle) is significant. In the first place Paul uses the title 'called apostle' for himself (I Cor. 1:1; Rom. 1:1). Even more telling is the fact that he seems consciously to present his call in a manner which brings to mind the call stories of the Old Testament prophets. Apparently he wants his apostleship to be thought of in prophetic terms.

The similarity between Paul's statement of his call and that of Jeremiah is striking.[1] In Gal. 1:15 we read: "And when it pleased him who from my mother's womb (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου) had set me apart and who called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me." In the LXX ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου also appears in Jeremiah's call story. In Jer. 1:4f. we read:

---

[1]Some scholars have noted the similarity between the story of Isaiah's call (Isa. 6) and that of Paul as it is recorded in Acts 9, 22, 26, e.g., Jacob M. Myers & Edwin D. Freed, "Is Paul Among the Prophets," Interpretation, XX (1966), 40-53. Since the correctness of the historical account of Acts is so uncertain we shall confine ourselves to a discussion of Paul's own account.

> Before I formed you in the womb I knew you,
> and before you were born I consecrated you;
> I appointed you a prophet to the nations.

The ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου also appears in Isaiah 49:1-6 which discusses the calling of the prophet as God's servant.

> The Lord called me from the womb, from the body
> of my mother he named my name.
> he made my mouth like a sharp sword,
> in the shadow of his hand he hid me;
> he made me a polished arrow,
> in his quiver he hid me away.
> And he said to me, 'You are my servant,
> Israel, in whom I will be glorified.'
> . . . . . .
> And now the Lord says, who formed me from
> the womb to be his servant,
> to bring Jacob back to him,
> and that Israel might be gathered to him,
> for I am honored in the eyes of the Lord,
> and my God has become my strength . . .
> he says: 'It is too light a thing that you
> should be my servant. . . .'

The usage of the same expression in these accounts makes it apparent that Paul was strongly aware of his election by God and consciously selected the language of the call stories of the Old Testament prophets.[1] He shares with them the awareness of having been selected and set apart by God for a particular purpose.

A Man of Visionary Experiences

Another characteristic of the Old Testament prophets was the experience of visions.[2] The books of Isaiah, Obadiah,

---

[1]Cf. Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, trans. Frank Clark (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959), pp. 11-35; Karl Rengstorf, Apostleship, trans. J. R. Coates (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1955), pp. 53-62; Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetics (London: S. C. M. Press, 1961), pp. 223-224; Hans Windisch, Paulus und Christus (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1934), pp. 134-142.

[2]Myers & Freed, op. cit., p. 47.

and Nahum begin with accounts of visions which they had received. Many individual pronouncements are introduced with such phrases as: "The Lord showed me" (Amos 7:1; 4:7; 8:1; Jer. 38:21; Ezek. 11:25), "I saw the Lord" (Amos 9:1), or "I lifted up my eyes and looked" (Zech. 1:18; 2:1; 5:1; 6:1). The call of Isaiah came when he "saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up" (Isa. 6:1).

Paul also shared the experience of visions with the Old Testament prophets. In II Cor. 12:1-6 he refers to 'visions and revelations' of the Lord. It is generally agreed among scholars that he is making an oblique reference to himself when he says, "I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven" (v. 2), "caught up into Paradise" (v. 3). There "he heard things that cannot be told, which man cannot utter" (v. 4). This passage is significant, because as Davies says, "Here we are clearly dealing with an authentic ecstatic experience. . . ."[1] In speaking of his journey to Paradise he is not sure whether or not his material body went with him. There are other instances in his letters which indicate that Paul had ecstatic experiences. He could speak in tongues (Cf. I Cor. 14:6, 18-19). He had visions of the Lord. According to I Cor. 15:8 Christ appeared to the Apostle after he had appeared to James and all the apostles. The point is that Paul explicitly states that the visionary and ecstatic

---

[1]W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S. P. C. K., 1948), p. 197.

experiences which were common to the Old Testament prophets were also a part of his life.

For our study it is important to note that, although Paul had visions and times of ecstasy, he does not claim that such experiences are of primary importance. As we shall see in the next chapter it was not this aspect of prophetic activity which the Apostle wished to emphasize. Apparently Paul's opponents had tried to show that they were superior to him as apostles because of their enthusiastic experiences.[1] Paul is almost apologetic in his reply. He can claim the same experiences, but apparently he doesn't want to stress them. His attitude toward ecstasy is expressed in II Cor. 5:13 when he says: "For if we are beside ourselves, it is for God; if we are in our right mind, it is for you." When he was caught up in Paradise he says that he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter." As Filson points out, "This need not mean that he could not understand them. . . ."[2] More likely Paul does not want to speak of them because they will not have the effect of edifying the congregation which, as we shall see, was of utmost importance to Paul. Certainly this idea agrees with his expressed thinking about speaking in tongues, i.e., that he would rather speak five words with his mind "in order to instruct others than ten

---

[1]D. Hans Lietzmann, An die Korinther I/II (4th ed. sup. by Kummel, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1949), p. 153.

[2]Floyd V. Filson, "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. X, edited by George A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953), p. 406.

thousand in a tongue" (I Cor. 14:19). Paul referred to his visionary experiences in making claims for his apostleship, but it is clear that he did not consider them the most significant aspect of prophetic activity.

Servant of God

Prophets of the Old Testament are often referred to as 'servants of the Lord' (I Kg. 18:36; Isa. 20:3). Again and again 'servant' is placed in apposition to the prophet (II Kg. 9:7; 21:10; Jer. 7:25; 25:4; Ezek. 38:17; Dan. 9:6; Zech. 1:6). So much so that "the term becomes almost a technical designation for the prophets."[1] In the New Testament the author of Revelation also refers to prophets as servants (10:7; 11:18; 22:6). He considers himself a prophet and refers to his work as prophecy (20:7, 10,18,19). He calls himself a servant (1:1) and as a servant places himself among the prophets. He says: "I am a fellow servant with you and your brethren the prophets. . . ." (22:9). It is significant that Paul uses the title δοῦλος χριστοῦ (servant of Christ) in referring to himself three times (Rom. 1:1; Gal. 1:10; Phil. 1:1).

The Apostle uses the word δοῦλος thirty times in his writings but not always with the same meaning. Sass has shown that the reason for this varied usage can be traced to the Old

---

[1]William A. Beardslee, Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul (London: S. C. M. Press, 1961), p. 100.

Testament.[1] The Hebrew equivalent of עבד is δοῦλος which means slave and denotes the idea of work, service, dependence, devotion to the owning power. Sass points out that the relation of subject to king is transferred to the relation of Israel to God, and δοῦλος is used to denote this relationship, e.g., Ps. 34:22; Neh. 1:10; Isa. 54:17; 63:17; 65:8.[2] In other passages δοῦλος is used to stress the idea that only the commission of God makes a man into a servant. Being chosen is not at all dependent on the qualifications of the one selected; the choice and commission is that of God. "Only the effect of being chosen, the commission of God makes him, or them, a servant."[3] The selection comes not as a result of a natural relationship or of man meeting any demands, but purely from the free and inexplicable decision of God. They are called for a purpose,

---

[1]Gerhard Sass, "Zur Bedeutung von δοῦλος bei Paulus," Zeitschrift fur die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XL (1941), 24-32; cf. Adolf Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan (2nd ed. rev.; New York: George H. Doran, Co., 1927), pp. 376-378, who suggests that Paul's use of δοῦλος can be attributed to Hellenistic influence. He cites various inscriptions with the title 'slave of the Emperor.' Sass (p. 24) and Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, "δοῦλος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. & ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed. Gerhard Kittel, III (1965), 264-265, point out that, in the Greek usage, δοῦλος has no connection with the religious sphere. Rengstorf says: "There are only a few exceptions to this rule, and on closer inspection even these turn out to be more apparent than real." He discusses these instances and concludes: "In view of the interrelationship of gods and men which we find here, there would be little point in describing either service of God, or life under the eyes of God, as δουλεία, or in describing the worshippers as a δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ ." As we shall see, Paul adopts the Old Testament religious sense of the word.

[2]Ibid., p. 25. [3]Ibid., p. 26.

called as instruments to do the work of God. It is in this sense that the Old Testament prophets are referred to as servants. Often we read the phrase, "My servants, the prophets" (Jer. 7:25; 25:4).

In Paul's writings we find the whole scale of meanings denoted by δοῦλος. Sometimes he uses δοῦλος to refer to social status, e.g., I Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:18; Col. 3:11. In I Cor. 7:20-24 he points out that a Christian is a 'slave of Christ.' In the eyes of the world a man's social position is unchanged when he becomes a Christian, but Christ becomes the ultimate ruler of his life.[1]

Sometimes Paul uses δοῦλος in reference to one with a particular commission. It is in this sense that he refers to his co-workers as δοῦλος. In Col. 1:7 Epaphras is called a σύνδουλος (a fellow-servant) with Paul. In other passages the Apostle makes it clear that God selected Epaphras for a particular purpose. According to Col. 4:13 Epaphras worked hard for the churches of Colossae, Laodicea, and Hierapolis. It was through him that the Colossian congregation "heard and understood the grace of God in truth" (Col. 1:3). Epaphras continued with his special responsibility for the congregation of Colossae by constantly praying for them. Paul also refers to Tychicus as a σύνδουλος; he specifically states that he is

---

[1]Sass points out that nowhere does Paul speak in general about Christians as δοῦλοι χριστοῦ so we cannot say that he took over the collective sense as it is used in the Old Testament for Israel, p. 29.

being sent for a particular purpose, i.e., to tell of his (Paul's) condition and to exhort or encourage their hearts. In Phil. 1:1 Paul includes Timothy with himself in the title δοῦλοι χριστοῦ. In other passages Paul stresses the close connection of Timothy with himself in a common task and work (cf. Rom. 16:21; I Cor. 4:17; 16:10; I Th. 3:2). Timothy has the power to admonish the congregation. He does the work of the Lord (I Cor. 16:10, cf. I Th. 3:2). It is apparent that when Paul refers to his co-workers as δοῦλοι, his meaning is very close, if not identical, to that of the Old Testament references to the prophets.

Paul, in addition to calling himself a δοῦλος, uses the title δοῦλος χριστοῦ in two passages (Rm. 1:1; Gal. 1:10). In Rom. 1:1 he emphasizes his being called, being set apart for a particular task. He has been chosen by God to be his instrument in the accomplishment of his work. Sanday and Headlam point out the similarity between Paul's use of δοῦλος in reference to himself in this passage and the Old Testament use in regard to the prophets. They write:

> . . . it is noticeable how quietly St. Paul steps into the place of the prophets and leaders of the Old Covenant, and how quietly he substitutes the name of his own Master in a connection hitherto reserved for that of Jehovah.[1]

---

[1]W. Sanday & A. C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans of International Critical Commentary (2nd ed., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), p. 3.

According to Gal. 1:10 a true slave of Christ cannot consider the opinion of men when determining an action. He does not seek to please men except for Christ's sake. Sass observes that Paul is an apostle only by God and Christ; he also is a δοῦλος in the same sense, i.e., as δοῦλος of God he does not have to justify himself before men. He writes: "δοῦλος means: called by God and chosen for a certain task."[1] It is obvious that when Paul uses the term δοῦλος χριστοῦ as a title for himself it has the same connotation which servant of the Lord has in the Old Testament when attributed to the prophets. Beardslee asserts: "Though Paul does not apply to himself, or to other leaders of the Church, the term 'prophet' in its Old Testament meaning, he borrows from the Greek Bible a term expressing a 'prophetic' sense of vocation."[2]

A Man Persecuted for the Faith

The numerous references in Paul's letters to his suffering is another indication that he considered himself a prophet. Many scholars have observed the close relationship between the prophet and the figure of the martyr at the beginning of the Christian era.[3] The association of these two figures is rooted in the Old Testament where many prophets are depicted as suffering for their beliefs and actions. Fischel writes: "An

---

[1]Sass, op. cit., p. 31. [2]Beardslee, op. cit., p. 101.

[3]Wilhelm Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (2nd ed., Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1906), pp. 218ff.; Franklin W. Young, "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-Examination," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1946), 289-295.

almost stereotyped formula in the historical books and Jeremiah refers to the failure of the prophets and, implicitly, to their sufferings."[1] I Chron. 16:22, for example, alludes to the dangerous task of the prophet, "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm." In Neh. 9:26 we learn that the people of Israel rebelled against God, cast down his law and killed the prophets.

With the coming of the Greeks into Palestine and the pressure of hellenization of the Jews, persecution increased and the number of those who suffered and died for their beliefs increased. Bousset says that from the time of the Maccabees this group held a place of honor among the pious Jews. He writes: "Seit der Makkabäerzeit sind sie die Führer and Heroen der Religion und des Glaubens."[2] He notes that in Dan. 11:33 and 12:3 the prophet is already honored. II Maccabees, especially the seventh chapter, includes many legends of the martyrs of the Maccabean period.

Not only was the glory of the martyr enhanced during this period, but also his identification with the prophet appears to have developed to the point that it was taken for granted. Bousset says: "In unser Zeit enstanden die Prophetenmartyrien."[3] He supports this view by referring to the legend of the "Martyrdom of Isaiah" which is the first section of the

---

[1]H. A. Fischel, "Martyr and Prophet," Jewish Quarterly Review, XXXVII (1946-47), 270.

[2]Bousset, op. cit., p. 218. [3]Ibid., p. 218.

"Ascension of Isaiah." Charles says that the legend was "certainly a Jewish tradition . . . which cannot be much later than the middle of the first century A.D."[1]

Blank points out another text which would support Bousset's view. The Targum to Lamentation 2:20 refers to the martyrdom of another prophet, Zechariah. After the words: "Shall the priest and the prophet be slain in the sanctuary of the Lord?," the Targumist adds the comment: "As you killed Zechariah the son of Iddo, the High Priest and faithful prophet in the sanctuary of the Lord on the Day of Atonement because he admonished them not to do what was displeasing to the Lord."[2] The study of another Jewish scholar, Fischel, who believes that "the New Testament teachings on the task and fate of the prophet is based on this Jewish belief and presuppose a number of midrashic stories,[3] also supports Bousset's view. After a consideration of Rabbinic Literature he says:

> In conclusion, it can be said that as early as first century C.E. it had become a generally accepted teaching of Judaism that prophets had to suffer or even to undergo martyrdom. The tenet was exemplified by midrashic reports on the sufferings or deaths of the prophets. 4

The New Testament, itself, includes examples which show the close association of prophet and martyr. Matthew, for

---

[1]"Martyrdom of Isaiah," trans. & ed. R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudipegrapha, Vol. II, ed. R. H. Charles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 158.

[2]Cited by Sheldon Blank, "The Death of Zechariah in Rabbinic Literature," Hebrew Union College Annual, XII-XIII (1937-38), 327.

[3]Fischel, op. cit., p. 279. [4]Ibid., p. 279.

example, depicts Jesus as lashing out at the Pharisees in words which reflect the suffering of prophets:

> Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you build the tombs of the prophets and adorn the monuments of the righteous, saying, 'If we had lived in the days of our father, we would not have taken part with them in shedding the blood of the prophets.' Thus you witness against yourselves, that you are sons of those who murdered the prophets (23:29-31).[1]

Paul also links the prophets with the idea of suffering. In I Th. 2:15, for example, he refers to the Jews as the ones "who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets."[2] It is evident that, at the beginning of the Christian era, the figure of the prophet was closely associated with the persecution and suffering which are the fate of the martyrs. As Young says, "In a sense prophetic death as well as prophetic life was typed." To this statement he appends a footnote which is helpful:

> For our purpose it is illuminating to reverse the order: it was commonly known that if a prophet followed the pattern of the venerated prophets of old, then he inevitably was faced with martyrdom. The age-old pronouncement that prophets were scorned, stoned and killed appears to have eventually been formalized conceptually in the reverence for the martyrs and in literary form by the martyrdoms of Judaism and Christianity.[3]

This fact is significant for our study, because Paul includes references to Christian suffering. In some passages he indicates that suffering was expected; it was a normal part of

---

[1]Cf. Mt. 5:12; Luke 13:32f.; Acts 7:52; Heb. 11:32-38; James 5:10; Rev. 11:3ff.

[2]Cf. Rom. 11:3ff. which will be discussed below.

[3]Young, op. cit., pp. 294-296.

the life of any Christian, for anyone who imitates Christ. He refers to Epaphroditus as having nearly died for the work of Christ (Phil. 2:30) and to the Thessalonians as having suffered at the hand of their own countrymen (I Th. 2:14). Although Paul refers to the suffering of Christians in general, he appears to emphasize the fact that he has suffered for his beliefs and actions particularly in relation to his work as an apostle. He includes many instances of his own suffering and writes about them in detail. II Corinthians alone supports this statement. In 1:8 he writes of the affliction he experienced in Asia: "for we were so utterly, unbearably crushed of life itself." In 4:8 we read: "We are afflicted in every way but not crushed; perplexed, but not driven to despair; persecuted but not forsaken; struck down, but not destroyed." In 6:4-10:

> . . . but as servants of God we commend ourselves in everyway: through great endurance, in afflictions, hardships, calamities, beatings, imprisonments, tumults, labors, watching, hunger. . . . We are treated as imposters, and yet are true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as punished, and yet not killed; as poor, yet making many rich; has having nothing, and yet possessing everything.

In 11:6-32, defending his position as an apostle, he recalls his labor, imprisonments and beatings. He says:

> Five times I have received at the hands of the Jews the forty lashes less one. Three times I have been beaten with rods; once I was stoned. Three times I have been shipwrecked; a night and a day I have been adrift at sea; on frequent journeys, in danger from rivers, danger from robbers, danger from my own people, danger from Gentiles, danger in the city, danger in the wilderness, danger at sea, danger from false brethren; in toil and hardship, through many a sleepless night, in hunger and thirst, often without food, in cold and exposure.

> And, apart from other things, there is the daily pressure upon me of my anxiety for all the churches (11:24-28).

References to his suffering are found in other letters. In I Th. 3:3 he indicates that he considers affliction as an inevitable part of his vocation or calling (cf. II Cor. 1:3-7; I Cor. 4:10-13). According to Phil. 3:10 he desires to share the suffering of Christ. He says that the work of the proclamation of the gospel has advanced because of his imprisonment (Phil. 1:14-18).

In Gal. 6:17 Paul says: "Henceforth, let no man trouble me; ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάξω (for I bear the marks of Jesus in my body)." Most scholars agree that τὰ στίγματα refers to the results of his suffering.[1] By using ἐν τῷ σώματί μου Paul probably points to the actual physical effects, the scars. It is possible that Paul also had in mind a metaphorical interpretation for στίγματα which enriches its meaning. Sanders points out that the στίγματα could

---

[1]Ernest D. Burton, A Critical Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians of International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), p. 360; Ragnar Bring, Commentary on Galatians, trans. Eric Wahlstrom (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), p. 292; John Calvin, Commentaries of the Epistles of Paul to Galatians and Ephesians, trans. William Pringle (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1954), p. 187; George S. Duncan, The Epistles of Paul to the Galatians of Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper & Bros., 1934), p. 193; Pierre Bonnard, "L'Epitre de Saint Paul aux Galates," Commentaire du Noveau Testament, Vol. IX (Paris: Delachaux & Niestle' S.A., 1953), pp. 131-132; Raymond T. Stamm, "The Epistle to the Galatians, Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. X, ed. George A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953), pp. 591-592; J. N. Sanders, "Galatians," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., 1962), p. 979.

refer to the brand marks of a devotee or a slave which designated his master's ownership. He writes: "Devotees were tattooed or branded (as well as slaves), and to attack them was to attack the god who owned them."[1] As we saw Paul also referred to himself as a δοῦλος (a servant) of Jesus Christ. Likely Paul had both ideas in mind when he chose στίγματα. Burton says: ". . . it (is) most probable that it is the idea of himself as a slave of Jesus, marked as such by the scars of his suffering, that underlies the language of the apostle."[2] By referring to his suffering for the sake of the gospel Paul brings attention to his prophetic role.

As we noted Paul refers to the suffering of all Christians. It is entirely possible that, in doing so, he points to the prophetic role of every Christian for, as we shall see, he considered all members of the congregation as prophets. However, the point to be noted here is that Paul frequently talks of his own suffering when discussing his vocation or making claims for the legitimacy of his apostleship. Apparently, he wants to stress the prophetic aspect of his apostleship.

Spokesman of God

The Old Testament prophetic writings reveal that the prophets were keenly aware of their role as spokesmen for God. They were convinced that they spoke the word of Yahweh. In Isa. 38:4-5 we read: "Then the word of the Lord came to Isaiah:

---

[1]Ibid. [2]Burton, op. cit., p. 301.

'Go and say to Hezekiah, Thus says the Lord. . . ." In Isa. 66:5: "Hear the word of the Lord, you who tremble at his word. . . ." Amos reports: ". . . the Lord said to me, 'Go, prophesy to my people Israel.' Now therefore hear the word of the Lord" (7:15-16). Jeremiah says: "But the Lord said to me, . . . to whom I send you you shall go, and whatever I command you you shall speak. . . . Then the Lord put forth his hand and touched my mouth; and the Lord said to me, 'Behold I have put my words in your mouth'." (1:7,9). Hosea begs: "Hear the word of the Lord, O people of Israel. . . ." (4:1). Such announcements are frequent and make it clear that the prophets were conscious of being bearers of God's word. Sometimes the prophets associated the reception of the word of the Lord with the coming of God's Spirit. Zechariah speaks of the law and words which God sent by the Spirit through the prophets (7:12). Ezekiel describes the coming of God's message to him:

> He, (the Lord) said to me,
> 'Son of Man, all my words that I shall speak to you receive in your heart and hear with your ears. And go, get you to the exiles, to your people and say to them, "Thus says the Lord God"; whether they hear or refuse to hear.'
> Then the Spirit lifted me up, and as the glory of the Lord arose from its place, I heard behind me the sound of a great earthquake. . . . (3:10-12)

A study by H. Wheeler Robinson reveals the Old Testament idea that the true prophet stood in the council of the Lord, heard him speak, and relayed to the people his direction for the situation at hand.[1] The Hebrew word for council is sodh.

---

[1]H. Wheeler Robinson, "The Council of Yahweh," Journal of Theological Studies, XLV (1944), 151-157; cf. also Frank M. Cross, Jr., "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," Journal

Lindblom points out that in the Old Testament it means "in the first place consultation, then a group of men consulting together, and finally a decision, plan, or purpose, which is the result of consultation."[1] A good illustration of council, or sodh, is found in Jeremiah where Yahweh says of the false prophets, "But if they had stood in my council then they would have proclaimed my words to my people" (23:22). The implication is clear: if the false prophets had taken part in the consultation, they would have known the words, thoughts and decisions of Yahweh to announce to the people. The same word appears in Amos 3:7 where it refers to the result of consultation: "Surely the Lord God does nothing, without revealing his sodh (i.e., his plans and decisions) to his servants the prophets." It is directly to the prophets that the Lord reveals his deliberated judgments. As Myers and Freed say: "Admission to the intimate council of the Lord meant special acquaintance with the will, purpose, and plans of the Eternal, which the prophet-observer, by virtue of his position must declare to God's people."[2]

This background explains why the Old Testament prophets spoke with such authority. They spoke "a definite and urgent message which was not derived from tradition nor produced by

---

of Near Eastern Studies, XII (1953), 274-277; J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1962), pp. 112-113; Edwin C. Kingsbury, "The Prophets and the Council of Yahweh," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1964), 279-286.

[1]Lindblom, op. cit., p. 112.

[2]Myers and Freed, op. cit., p. 48.

reflection upon an existing body of religious belief. It came to them as immediate, divine revelation."[1] The prophets often expressed the overwhelming power of this revelation in the stories of their call and commission. Amos says: "The lion has roared; who will not fear? The Lord God has spoken; who can but prophesy?" (3:8). In other words, the prophet was compelled to speak. The commanding power of the word of Yahweh is graphically expressed by Jeremiah:

> For the word of the Lord has become for me
> a reproach and derision all day long.
> If I say, 'I will not mention him,
> or speak any more in his name,'
> there is in my heart as it were a
> burning fire shut up in my bones
> and I am weary with holding it in,
> and I cannot. (20:8b-9)

Napier observes in all the classical prophets, to a greater or lesser extent, "the phenomenon of the psychology of captivity, a self-consciousness in vocation characterized by the feeling of having been overpowered by the word of Yahweh."[2] As spokesmen of this powerful word, which they were unable to resist, the prophets, no doubt, had an incredible sense of responsibility and authority as they announced God's message to his people. The prophets succinctly stated that their words carried the authority of the one whose message they spoke with the awe-inspiring phrase: "Thus says the Lord."

---

[1]R. B. Y. Scott, The Relevance of the Prophets (New York: MacMillan Co., 1957), p. 84.

[2]B. Davie Napier, "Prophet, Prophetism," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 912.

Paul's letters indicate that he had the same awesome awareness of responsibility and authority in regard to his mission. He claims a great deal for his authority as an apostle. He says: "If anyone refuses to obey what we say in this letter, note that man, and have nothing to do with him, that he may be ashamed" (II Th. 3:14; cf. I Cor. 14:37). In II Cor. 13:1-3 Paul warns that he will exercise severe discipline against sinners. This will be a proof that Christ is speaking in him. "For he was crucified in weakness, but lives by the power of God. For we are weak in him, but in dealing with you we shall live with him by the power of God" (II Cor. 13:4). In I Cor. 5:3-5 the Apostle says that he has already pronounced judgment against a man guilty of incest. In I Cor. 7:12 he seems to assume authority comparable to that of the Lord in making a judgment regarding divorce. Apparently Paul was accused of exerting too much authority. He refuses to apologize and defends his position: "For even if I boast a little too much of our authority, which the Lord gave for building you up and not for destroying you. . . ." (II Cor. 10:8). In II Cor. 13:10 we find a similar statement: "I write this while I am away from you, in order that when I come I may not have to be severe in my use of authority which the Lord has given me for building up and not for tearing down." There can be little doubt, as Windisch observes, that Paul is alluding to Jer. 1:10.[1] The

---

[1]Hans Windisch, Der zweite Korinthbrief (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924), p. 303; cf. Munck, op. cit., p. 26.

similarity is striking. After Jeremiah recalls that the Lord touched his mouth and gave him words to speak, he quotes the Lord:

> See, I have set you this day over nation
> and kingdoms,
> to pluck up and to break down,
> to destroy and to overthrow,
> to build and to plant.

Paul's formal claim of apostolic authority which the Lord gave him is couched in terms of Jeremiah's prophetic call. His call, like those of the Old Testament prophets, carried an endowment of authority.

Paul also shared with the Old Testament prophets the conviction that he had received a special, divine revelation and had an inner compulsion to speak. In Gal. 1:12 he says that the gospel he preaches came through a revelation of Jesus Christ; he did not receive it from man. He says that he has been entrusted with a commission (I Cor. 9:17; cf. II Cor. 2:17) and feels compelled to preach the gospel. In I Cor. 9:16 we read: "For necessity is laid upon me. Woe is me if I do not preach the gospel."

Paul sometimes expresses his apostolic authority by stating his close association with the Spirit, which, as we saw, is closely identified with prophecy in the Old Testament and Rabbinic Literature. In I Cor. 2 we read: "my speech and my message were not in plausible words of wisdom, but in demonstration of Spirit and power" (v.4); "God has revealed to us through the Spirit" (v.10); and "we impart this in words not

taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit" (v. 13; cf. Rom. 15:19; I Th. 1:15). After making pronouncements about some problems regarding marriage in I Cor. 7, Paul says: "and I think that I have the Spirit of God" (v. 40).

In other passages Paul, like the Old Testament prophets, emphasizes that his words are authoritative not because they are his words but because they are the words of God and Christ. In I Th. 2:13 we read: "when you received the word of God which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men but as what it really is, the word of God which is at work in you believers." Paul refuses to tamper with God's word (II Cor. 4:2) and says: "for we are not, like so many, peddlers of God's word; but as men of sincerity, as commissioned by God, in the sight of God we speak in Christ" (II Cor. 2:17).

From this consideration of Paul's frequent use of Old Testament prophetic attributes and appellations in regard to his vocation, it is clear that he considered himself an apostle who stood in the Old Testament prophetic line. He draws a definite parallel between himself and the prophets in regard to his call and in regard to his role as a δοῦλος, as one who suffers as a result of his belief and work, and as an authoritative spokesman for God.

The Prophetic Word

As spokesmen of God, what was the authoritative word which the prophets spoke? It is beyond the scope of this study

to analyze the Old Testament prophetic writings. However, it is an accepted fact among biblical scholars that one of the primary, if not the primary, functions of the Old Testament prophets was ethical; as proclaimers of God's will their announcements reminded Israel of her moral obligations as the people of God. H. Wheeler Robinson writes: "The primary function of the prophet is to awaken the consciousness of Israel to the presence and power of God and to evoke that inner spirit of obedience. . . . No function of prophecy is more obvious than this."[1] Scott comments;

> The prophetic oracles constantly inject into the religious situation the clamant moral demands as an active and interested deity. They contribute to ethical vitality by calling for response and decision, and by relating the present to the future in terms of the historic purpose of Yahweh and his moral government of the world.[2]

The prophetic word was rooted and grounded in the prophet's knowledge of God.

Rowley notes the ethical strain in the Israelite religion which was greatly developed by the eighth and seventh century prophets and attributes it to the nature of God. He writes:

> They (the prophets) perceived what God was like, and therefore what man must be. Man's rights were his, not because of what he was in himself, but because God willed them, and God willed them . . . because of what He was in Himself. If justice and mercy are of the essence of God's being, then in these things He must delight, and men who honour Him must honour Justice and Mercy, which inhere in Him.[3]

---

[1]H. Wheeler Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), pp. 162-163.

[2]Scott, op. cit., p. 102. [3]Rowley, op. cit., p. 153.

Scott would agree that it is the nature of God which determines the kind of word which the prophets declared. He says: "It is this knowledge of God and understanding of his ways which the prophets would declare through their censure and exhortations."[1] It was Micah's knowledge of God, for example, which prompted him to write: "He has showed you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness and to walk humbly with your God" (6:8).

It must also be noted, indeed stressed, that the Old Testament prophetic word was not simply a statement of an ideal but it arose, as Porteous says, "in the existential situation in which men are not just meditating on ethical possibilities but are wrestling in the midst of ethical situations."[2] Old Testament literature is full of denunciations of the evil conduct of the contemporary society to which the prophet belongs. The word of the prophet was addressed to a particular problem. The prophet Nathan said to David, "Thou art the man!," making clear the prophet's responsibility to pronounce judgment on a specific moral situation. Amos spared no words of doom in speaking to the Israelites when they failed to be concerned for their neighbors, and injustice ran rampant (6:4-7; 4:1-3). Their worship of God had become a mockery, and he said:

> I hate, I despise your feasts,
> and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies.

---

[1]Scott, op. cit., p. 96.

[2]Norman W. Porteous, "Ritual and Righteousness," Interpretation, III (1949), 409.

> Even though you offer me your burnt offerings
> and cereal offerings, I will not accept them,
> and the peace offerings of your fatted beasts
> I will not look upon.
> Take away from me the noise of your songs;
> to the melody of your harps I will not listen.
> But let justice roll down like waters,
> and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream.
> (5:21-24; cf. 4:4-6)

Isaiah also denounced the moral decay of Israel where the rich became richer at the expense of the poor (5:8-10; 10:1-4). "Worse, the national religion had become a hollow and external thing which tolerated these abuses without protest and, demanding only lavish ritual, fostered the delusion of unconditional national security based on the promises of God (1:10-20; Mic. 3:9-11)."[1] Confronted with social injustice, false pride, hypocritical religious practices, personal immorality, unfaithfulness to God, Amos and Isaiah, as well as the other prophets, lashed out with scathing criticisms, reminding Israel of her moral obligations as the people of God. The Old Testament prophetic word was the announcement of God's purpose and will as it impinged upon the concrete circumstances of the prophet's own time.

What was the prophetic word which Paul spoke? It must be emphasized that Paul was primarily a proclaimer of the gospel (Gal. 1:11; I Cor. 1:17; Col. 1:23; Rom. 15:16-19). However, as it has been pointed out, Paul's letters indicate that he saw the necessity for exhortation. He compares himself to a father exhorting and encouraging his children and charging

---

[1]John Bright, "Isaiah-I," Peake's Commentary of the Bible, ed. Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., 1962), p. 489.

them "to lead a life worthy of God" (I Th. 2:11-12). Schrage writes: ". . . die paulinischen Briefe als ganze sind als Fortsetzung der mundlichen Verkündigung voll von Mahnung, Weisung und Gebot. Auch Gottes Forderung trifft den Menschen also nicht neben oder losgelöst von der apostolischen Verkündigung, sondern gerade in ihr."[1]

In his hortatory sections the apostle's awareness that he is the spokesman, the mouthpiece, of God is evident. Often he introduces his paranesis with the reminder that the words he speaks are the words of the Lord. He exhorts 'in the name of the Lord' (II Th. 3:60); 'in the Lord' (I Th. 4:1; II Th. 3:12); 'by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ' (I Cor. 1:10); 'by the mercies of God' (Rom. 12:1); 'by the Lord Jesus Christ' (Rom. 15:30); 'by the meekness and gentleness of Christ' (II Cor. 10:1). Paul does not mean that he is quoting the words of Jesus. In I Cor. 7:12 he makes a clear distinction between his remarks and those of the historical Jesus. He is God's representative as he makes hortatory announcements whether he is following the specific words of Jesus or not. In I Cor. 7 after distinguishing his remarks from those of Jesus, he says: "I think that I have the Spirit of God" (v. 40). Schrage writes:

> Paulus ist sich bewusst, im Namen Christi aufzutreten. Wer aber Christi Namen nennt und unter Berufung auf seinen Namen mahnt, rechnet mit seiner Wirksamkeit und nimmt seine Autorität fur sich in Anspruch;

---

[1]Schrage, op. cit., p. 103.

> ἐν τῷ ὀνοματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰ. χρ. heisst hier von allem: in seinem Auftrag ermahnen, vom gegenwärtigen Herrn zum Mahnen beauftragt und bevollmächtigt sein. Der Apostel spricht und ermahnt also an Christi Statt, was wiederum heisst, dass Gott mahnend und handelnd gegenwärtig ist und zu Worte kommt.[1]

It is evident that Paul referred not only to himself in terms used for the prophets in the Old Testament, he also considered his words to be those of the Lord. Like the classical prophets, he felt compelled to announce to God's people their ethical responsibility. The crucial difference between Old Testament and New Testament prophecy is the coming of Jesus Christ. He is the true, full revealer of the pure, immediate will of God. The prophets of the Old Testament interpreted what the nature and will of God meant in the daily life of people only in part. Jesus came as the absolute revealer of God's nature and will. Since the purpose of God was revealed completely with the coming of Jesus, it remained for Paul and the Christian prophets, not only to proclaim the revelation of God in Christ, but, also, like the Old Testament prophets, to interpret what this revelation meant in the concrete, daily life of the church. Paul's letters show that he did precisely this.

For Paul, Jesus revealed that the nature and will of God was essentially love. This is not to deny that Paul emphasizes God's power and righteousness which the gospel reveals (Rom. 1:1). It is precisely because God is righteous and

---

[1]Schrage, op. cit., p. 104.

demands righteousness that his act for man's reconciliation was necessary. The supreme manifestation of God's love is the cross. God, who is righteous, requires that man be righteous, but it was his action performed in Jesus Christ which effected reconciliation, atonement, between God and man. God came in Christ to do for man what man could not do for himself. Out of grace, by an act of self-sacrificing, unmerited love, Christ did the act, paid the price, which effected salvation for all men. Man's salvation originates from, springs from, the love of God. In his life and death Jesus revealed this love to man once and for all.

That Paul understood his apostolic role as closely associated with the cross is seen in II Cor. 3:5 where he says that God "has qualified us to be ministers of the new covenant." Jeremiah spoke of a new covenant. In 31:31-33 we read:

> Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, my covenant which they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

According to I Cor. 11:25 it is clear that Paul believed that the new covenant was established with the sacrificial death of Jesus which was the supreme revelation of God's love for man.

Paul's reference to himself as the minister of this covenant is significant for his prophetic role.

Beardslee points out that in Paul's writings διάκονος (servant) is a parallel term to δοῦλος whose prophetic significance we have considered. He writes: "the different emphasis of the term is apparent in the fact that διάκονος, in none of its uses, explicitly emphasizes subjection, as δοῦλος often does."[1] He also says that διάκονος "does not signify a personal relationship so much as a commission to work," and "the servant is often qualified according to his particular task."[2] It is apparent that Paul saw his particular task as a διάκονος of the new covenant to be an ethical one, because he describes his role in terms of the law and the Spirit. As we saw in the last chapter the 'walk according to the Spirit' is the proper walk for one who is in Christ.

Paul's conception of his apostolic role as interpreter of the nature and will of God as revealed in the cross is also manifested in his appeal to the example of Jesus Christ in his exhortations. Davies says: "There can be little question that for Paul every Christian is pledged to an attempted ethical conformity to Christ."[3] Paul urges conformity to Christ's self-giving. In Cor. 8:9 he urges his readers to prove that their love is genuine and he appeals to the example of Jesus Christ

---

[1]Beardslee, op. cit., p. 102. [2]Ibid., p. 103.

[3]W. D. Davies, "Ethics in the New Testament," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick, II (1962), 173.

who "though he was rich, yet for your sake he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich." Phil. 2:1-8 has the same idea. Paul exhorts the congregation:

> complete my joy by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind. Do nothing from selfishness or conceit, but in humility count others better than yourselves. Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of others. Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus. . . . (vv. 2-5)

Again, Paul makes this plea on the basis of Christ's self-giving act of humiliation and death on the cross. It appears that, for Paul, to have the mind of Christ is to have the mind of love. It has been suggested that the description of ἀγάπη in I Cor. 13 is based on the life of Jesus; in short it is a kind of character sketch of the Lord."[1]

The point is: it is the love of God which Jesus revealed in his life and death. We have seen that, for Paul, love is the law of the Christian life, and in his exhortations the Apostle appeals to the self-giving example, the love, of Jesus Christ. Paul's ethical exhortations, like the Old Testament prophetic word, are rooted and grounded in his knowledge of the nature of God.

Like the classical prophets Paul also interprets the will and purpose of God in concrete terms. He speaks to a particular people in a particular situation confronted with a particular problem. In the next chapter we shall see that I

---

[1]Cf. Davies, Paul. . . ., p. 146; C. H. Dodd, History and Gospel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938), p. 66.

Corinthians is an excellent example, because it is concerned almost wholly with immediate, practical problems which had arisen in the church such as improper sexual behavior, factions in the congregation, eating meat sacrificed to idols, misunderstanding the true nature of spiritual gifts. The long sections of hortatory material in other letters (Rom. 12:1-15:13; Gal. 5:13-6:10; Col. 3:5-4:6; I Th. 4:1-5:12) indicate that Paul wrote them to meet particular needs as they arose. His admonishments make explicit the will of God in concrete situations. For Paul, the Christian has entered a new life, and he spells out what this means in terms of everyday existence.

It is clear that, although Paul does not specifically refer to himself as a prophet, he deliberately chose terms and appellations for his role and vocation as an apostle which place him squarely in the prophetic tradition. He apparently consciously drew parallels between himself and the Old Testament prophets in making claims for his authority as an apostle.[1] As we noted, this fact has been taken up by many scholars to indicate Paul's strong sense of apostleship. It remains for us to explore the questions as to why Paul selects prophetic terms to describe and make claims for his apostleship. As background

---

[1]William H. Brownlee, The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 140-143 observes that the traits of the Servant of the Lord of Isa. 40-55 can be seen in the Teacher of Righteousness. Brownlee includes many of the characteristics included here as pertaining to the Old Testament prophets in general, e.g., the call, endowed with the Spirit, man of suffering.

for this study a consideration of Paul's understanding of his apostolic role will be helpful.

Paul's Understanding of His Apostleship.

Most New Testament scholars agree that the early Christian use of the term ἀπόστολος is related to the Hebrew verb שלח which means 'send' and often carries the meaning 'to commission.'[1] Beare writes:

> In its Christian usage, it is simply a translation of the Aramaic word shaliach, a title widely used in later Judaism of an official sent out as an authorized representative of his principles, with full powers to execute the commission which has been entrusted to him. He is an agent, a plenipotentiary; his dignity, and his right to be heard, derives from the dignity and the authority of the sender, not from any personal qualities; but in his capacity of shaliach, in the fulfillment of the mission which has been entrusted to him, his principal speaks and acts through him.[2]

The same conception of the shaliach appears in the Mishnah, e.g., in the Berakoth 5:5 we read: "A man's agent (shaliach) is like to him."

Rengstorf observes that, although the term שליח is not found in the Old Testament and Rabbinic Literature for the designation of any office in the technical sense, it is used in designating priests and various individuals, e.g., Moses, Elijah, Elisha, and Ezekiel, who serve as representatives of

---

[1]Cf. Beardslee, op. cit., p. 79; T. W. Manson, The Church's Ministry (London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1948), pp. 35-45; Rengstorf, op. cit., pp. 25-31.

[2]Frank W. Beare, "The Ministry in the New Testament Church," Anglican Theological Review, XXXVII (1955), 13.

God.[1] For our study it is significant that the word שלוח is not used for prophets or Jewish missionaries. Rengstorf attributes this fact to an understanding of missionaries and prophets which thought of them as speaking for God, not acting for him. He writes: "Taking prophets and missionaries together we can only say that the ultimate reason for avoiding the term is to be found in the fact that they speak of God, in His name, but still do not represent Him, in so far as they perform no action."[2] This distinction underlines the essential meaning of 'apostle' that he is an authoritative representative of the one sending him out to fulfill a special commission.

It must be noted that ἀπόστολος can be used for one who is commissioned by a community. Paul uses the term twice in this sense. In II Cor. 8:23 he applies it to delegates commissioned to take the gift of the Greek churches to the Jerusalem congregation. Phil. 2:25 refers to Epaphroditus as an ἀπόστολος of the Philippian community, because he had represented that church in ministering to Paul's need.

There is no question but that Paul was convinced that he was an apostle of Jesus Christ. He begins four of his letters with an affirmation of his apostleship. We read in

---

[1]Rengstorf, op. cit., pp. 21-24.

[2]Ibid., p. 23; cf. also Manson, op. cit., pp. 37-45; Hermann Vogelstein, "The Development of the Apostolate in Judaism and its Transformation in Christianity," Hebrew Union College Annual, II (1925), 99-123.

Rom. 1:1: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God"; in I Cor. 1:1: "Paul, called by the will of God to be an apostle of Christ Jesus"; in II Cor. 1:1: "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God"; and in Gal. 1:1: "Paul an apostle--not from men nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father."[1] Throughout his letters we find claims and defenses of his apostleship (cf. Rom. 11:13; I Cor. 9:1-18; 15:9; II Cor. 11:4-6; 12:11-12; Gal. 1:15-17).

Paul's understanding of his apostleship has been the subject of considerable speculation among New Testament scholars. The most significant discussion has centered in the thesis that Paul understood his apostleship eschatologically. Fridrichsen points out that, in trying to understand the meaning of 'apostle' as used by Paul, it is necessary to keep in mind the eschatological way of thinking which dominated late Judaism and the early church. He emphasizes the following characteristic traits of this thinking:

> Firstly, the events of the final era follow each other according to a fixed plan leading to a definitive goal: the destruction of the old world and the establishment of the new, eternal aeon. Secondly, this predetermined series of eschatologic events is bound up with certain elected persons who have a distinct and particular place in God's plan of salvation, and who have been given to play a strictly defined role in the great final drama, a role to which they, and they alone, are called--and for which they are specially equipped. Person and ministry are here inextricably one. These men are

---

[1]Colossians and Ephesians, as well as the Pastoral epistles, begin with this affirmation.

> chosen and set apart. They are not ordinary people, but they are, so to speak, official personages of the kingdom of God on the same line as the chosen Old Testament instruments of God's dealings with Israel. . . .[1]

Fridrichsen maintains that Paul's references to himself as κλητὸς ἀπόστολος (Rom. 1:1) or as one 'set apart' before he was born (Gal. 1:15) reflect the fundamental eschatological conception that "he is a man who has been appointed to a proper place and a peculiar task in the series of events to be accomplished in the final days of this world."[2] In other words, according to Fridrichsen, for Paul his apostolate had eschatological significance; it held a crucial position in the eschatological development between the resurrection and the parousia. Paul does not consider the work of other apostles, not even those of Jesus, as having the same eschatological significance as his own. Fridrichsen writes: "Jesus sent out twelve chosen disciples to preach the gospel to Israel; and here we have a sort of eschatological apostolate, but only for a short time. When the Apostles returned to their Master after having accomplished their task, their apostolate expired."[3] They had only a temporary apostolate in contrast to Paul's 'fully eschatologic apostolate' which was permanent.

Insight into Paul's concept of''apostolate in the real sense of the word' is found in Gal. 2:7-8. Referring to the

---

[1]Anton Fridrichsen, "The Apostle and His Message (Uppsala: Almquest & Wiksell, 1947), p. 3.

[2]Ibid., p. 3. [3]Ibid., p. 6.

transactions with the Jerusalem church he writes: "When they saw that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been entrusted with the gospel to the circumcised (for he who worked though Peter for the mission to the circumcised worked through me also for the Gentiles)." Fridrichsen concludes that Paul viewed the eschatological situation in the following way: "In this world, soon disappearing, the centre is Jerusalem with the primitive community and the Twelve, surrounded by the mission-field divided between two apostles: one sent by the Lord to the circumcised, the other to the Gentiles."[1] Although Paul recognizes and respects the work of others among the Gentiles, he regards himself as responsible for the entire field. Fridrichsen finds proof for this view in Romans which he believes is an attempt "to assert, in a discreet way, the apostolic authority and teaching of Paul in the church of Rome."[2]

In an article which appeared eleven years prior to Fridrichsen's work, Cullmann[3] argues for a similar thesis. He tries to show that the τὸ κατέχον (that which restrains) of II Th. 2:6ff. refers to the proclamation of the gospel to the gentiles and that ὁ κατέχων (he who restrains) refers to Paul as the missionary responsible for this preaching. Cullmann supports

---

[1]Ibid., p. 6. [2]Ibid., p. 7.

[3]Oscar Cullmann, "Le caractère eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de S. Paul," Revue d' Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, XVI (1936), 236; cf. also his Christ and Time, trans. Floyd V. Filson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950), pp. 164-167.

his view by pointing to Mark 13:10 and Matt. 24:14 which state that the gospel will be preached throughout the world among the gentiles (εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Mk. 13:10; εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Mt. 24:14) before the end. Cullmann asserts that Paul emphasizes the idea of preaching to all the gentiles. He writes:

> Mais il insiste sur le mot 'païens.' Quant à la tâche eschatologique qu'il faut remplir avant la fin, elle n'est plus, dès lors, pour S. Paul, la prédication de l'Évangile en général, mais d'une manière plus précise, la prédication aux païens.[1]

The point is that preaching to the gentiles has an eschatological character; therefore, eschatological significance must be attributed to Paul's apostleship. Cullmann writes: "S. Paul se sait l'instrument, non seulement de Dieu, mais encore d'un plan eschatologique tout à fait concret fixé par Dieu: d'abord, l'évangile doit etre prêché aux païens."[2] Paul's terrible sense of urgency is reflected in I Cor. 9:16 where he says: "For if I preach the gospel, that gives me no ground for boasting. For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!"

Munck accepts Cullmann's interpretation of II Th. 2:6ff. and carries his thesis further in his interpretation of Rom. 9-11 and Gal. 2. He says: "Preaching to the Gentiles occupies

---

[1]Cullmann, "Le caractère. . . .," p. 236.

[2]Ibid., p. 239.

a clear chronological place in God's plan of salvation. And even if the term κατέχον does not appear in the weighty presentation of Rom. 11, the idea about what is delaying the plan of salvation is clearly expressed there."[1] The eschatological scheme of Rom. 9-11 which presents the salvation of Israel as being dependent on the prior salvation of the gentiles makes Paul's role as missionary preacher crucial for the working out of God's plan of redemption. Munck writes:

> Paul is not only the one who knows what God's plan is and can tell of it, but the one by whose action this fullness is to be brought about. What has been accomplished--that great numbers of the Gentiles are accepting salvation--is already arousing the jealousy of the Jews, with the result that some of them are being saved (11:13f). And before long the fullness of the Gentiles will bring this jealousy to its culmination and make all Israel receive salvation (11:25f.). The apostle is certainly the apostle of the Gentiles, as he himself says (11:13); but his work in the mission to them is at the same time indirectly missionary work to Israel. In this way our text says the same as what Cullmann saw in II Thes. 2:6f., namely that Paul's work is more important than that of all the apostles who went to the Jews and were turned away by that impenitent nation (Rom. 10:16-21). Where their work failed, the way of salvation provided by God for Israel will become a reality through Paul's work for the Gentiles. This also means that the apostle's work is more important than that of all the figures in Old Testament redemptive history, because he has been appointed by God to fill the key position in the last great drama of salvation.[2]

Munck, like Fridrichsen, considers Gal. 2:7-8 important for understanding Paul's concept of his own apostleship. He asserts that, although Paul believed that Peter had an eschatological call to preach to the Jews, he considered his own call

---

[1]Munck, op. cit., p. 40. [2]Ibid., p. 43.

to the gentiles a more important one, "because its completion will usher in the salvation of all Israel."[1] Munck is unwilling to go as far as Windisch who asserts that Paul performed a greater service to God than Jesus, because the Apostle was sent to all nations, and Jesus was sent only to Israel.[2] Munck approaches the position of Windisch, however, when he makes the working out of God's eschatological plan dependent on Paul's apostolic work and says: "Paul, as the apostle to the Gentiles, becomes the central figure in the story of salvation."[3]

Some scholars think that Munck, as well as Cullmann, has overstated his case. Morton Smith argues that Munck is able to arrive at his position only because he has omitted a full account of the other apostles to the gentiles.[4] He maintains that Paul claimed for himself only preeminence as an

---

[1]Ibid., p. 62.

[2]Hans Windisch, Paulus und Christus (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1934), says: "Wir finden abermals eine wichtige Funktion im göttlichen Heilsplan, die in alttestamentlicher Profetengeschichte weissagungsmässig vorgebildet, in der neutestamentlichen Heilsgeschichte gleichmässig zwei nacheinander wirkenden Männern Gottes auferlegt ist: Jesus und Paulus. P. ist dadurch ausgezeichnet, dass auch er und nur er--nicht auch Petrus oder Johannes, denselben richterlichen Auftrag vollzieht. Ja bei P. hat die Dürchfuhrung noch grössere und ummfassendere Wirkung, da in seiner Aktion sogleich das positive Gegenstück sich realisiert: in demselben Augenblick, wo sich durch sein Wirken die Tür vor den Juden verschliesst, öffnet sich weit das Tor für die Heiden. Vorsehungsmässig verrichtet der Apostel auch hierin ein grösseres Werk als der Meister," pp. 149-150.

[3]Munck, op. cit., p. 61.

[4]Morton Smith, "Pauline Problems," Harvard Theological Review, L (1957), 128.

apostle to the gentiles, "not an exclusive competence."[1] Munck's position, says Smith, presents Paul as an 'egomaniac.'[2]

J. Knox takes issue with Cullmann and Munck when they "affirm that Paul thought of Christ's return as dependent on his."[3] However, he immediately warns that Paul's sense of vocation must be taken seriously. He writes:

> . . . for no one can doubt that Paul had a peculiar sense of vocation and a sense of peculiar vocation--that he thought of himself and his work as having an extraordinary importance of some kind in the working out of God's purpose in Christ. Over and over again in reading his letters, one is impressed, and sometimes repelled, by signs of what may appear to be an almost morbid sense of his own importance.[4]

Although Knox is willing to accept a high concept of apostleship on the part of Paul, he maintains that the position claimed by Cullmann and Munck is too high. He writes:

> . . . although he was convinced that God had called him to the work and may even have believed that he was the only witness of Jesus' resurrection (and therefore the only 'apostle' in the highest sense of that term) who had been directed explicitly and particularly to the gentiles; and although he may have regarded himself as having been set apart as a supreme defender of the propriety of the gentile mission--although all this may be true, he did not think of himself as the only preacher to the nations or find for himself a place in God's plan quite so exalted as Cullmann and Munck assert.[5]

Beardslee also has reservations about the thesis which places too much significance on the Apostles' eschatological

---

[1]Ibid., p. 129. [2]Ibid., p. 130.

[3]John Knox, "Rom. 15:14-33 and Paul's Apostolic Mission," Journal of Biblical Literature LXXXIII (1964), 4.

[4]Ibid., p. 5. [5]Ibid., p. 8.

role. Discussing Munck's view he writes that "it must be received with caution, since the details of the eschatological pattern are often left unclear by Paul, and this lack of clarity results partly from his pressing beyond a formal scheme of eschatology to a perception of the character of God, as known in Christ, as the motivating force of his activity."[1] At the same time, Beardslee praises Munck's thesis, because it stresses Paul's awareness of the importance of his vocation. He points out that Paul saw his position as one among many apostles

> yet his writings none the less show that he understood himself as having a special vocation among the apostles. Though he never speaks of himself as 'the apostle to the gentiles,' he does hold that God had chosen him for a special place within the task of proclamation. In some sense he believed that he was the most significant apostle.[2]

The point is that, although most scholars cannot go all the way with the view that Paul considered himself absolutely essential for the working out of God's plan of salvation, there is general agreement that Paul had an overwhelming sense of his vocation, that he had been called in a special way for a particular purpose. In our opinion it is precisely here that Paul's use of prophetic terms for describing his call and claiming his apostolic authority are relevant. In other words Paul uses prophetic attributes and appellations not simply to strengthen his position as an apostle, but because they are descriptive of the particular role he is called to fulfill. These terms say something about the nature of his apostleship.

---

[1]Beardslee, op. cit., p. 86. [2]Ibid., p. 92.

Paul as Prophet-Apostle

It must be noted that apparently there is nothing inherent in the concept of apostleship which connotes the idea of the prophetic. Our sources do not reveal that any other apostle thought of himself in terms of a prophet, nor does Paul seem to think of them in this manner. Although it is difficult to state specifically what constituted being an apostle in the early church, there is nothing in his writings to infer that Paul considered particular prophetic traits necessary requirements. Beardslee says:

> As Paul describes them, the specific functions of apostles included preaching and founding churches, and itinerancy was a common feature of their activity. The powers of the new age in the apostle are reflected in the miraculous signs which Paul mentions but does not emphasize. No one feature can be claimed as a necessary mark of the apostle, however; there was probably a good deal of fluidity in their actual activities. In other words, it was not any specific activity which marked the apostle, but rather his authoritative 'direct' representation of Christ.[1]

It has often been pointed out that Paul's call in the form of a revelation of the risen Christ was of primary significance for his apostleship. It cannot be denied that he placed great value on this experience (I Cor. 15:8; 9:1, Gal. 1:15,16). However, according to I Cor. 15:7, all the apostles saw the resurrected Lord. The point which is important for our study is that it is only his own experience of 'seeing the Lord' which Paul describes in terms of a prophetic call.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 90-91.

It is clear that Paul's use of prophetic terms was not essential for supporting his claim to be an apostle, not even his claim to be an apostle to the gentiles. This is not to deny that he believed he had a particular mission to the gentiles but to maintain that this task, in itself, does not necessitate prophetic description. The question remains: why did Paul express his apostolic mission to the gentiles in terms which are reminiscent of the Old Testament prophets? What was the nature of his work which prompted Paul to select prophetic terms when he described his call and sought to support his claims of authority as an apostle?

Fridrichsen comes close to the answer in his discussion of what Paul means by 'my gospel.'[1] According to Gal. 2:7 Paul has been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised and Peter to the circumcised. Fridrichsen points out that some scholars maintain that there is only one gospel, and this demarcation is made in terms of areas and not in regard to the message itself.[2] If so, how are we to understand phrases like τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου (my gospel, Rom. 2:16; 16:25); τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὅ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν (the gospel I preached to you, I Cor. 15:1); τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν εὐαγγελισθέν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ (the gospel which was preached by me, Gal. 1:11); τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὅ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (the gospel which I preach among the gentiles, Gal. 2:2). It seems clear from these texts that Paul does not have in mind

---

[1]Fridrichsen, op. cit., pp. 8-16. [2]Ibid., p. 8.

the gospel in general but a particular and distinct form of the gospel. He believed that he was called "to proclaim quite a peculiar and characteristic message of his own."[1] Fridrichsen presents a convincing case that what Paul calls 'my gospel,' "was based on the common Christian kerygma, but interpreted this kerygma in a special direction."[2] The direction is toward the uncircumcised, toward the gentiles. According to Paul Jesus did not rise as a Jewish Messiah, but as Lord of the universe. Christ died for all men, not just the Jews, and all can be saved through faith. In other words, Paul's message, which he refers to as 'my gospel,' is that, because of Christ's atoning work, the gentiles, without circumcision and submission to the law of Moses, can, through faith, become a part of the people of God and receive salvation. According to Fridrichsen, this new knowledge which Paul possesses and spreads among the gentiles is God's work; he has received it through a revelation as a part in the development of the eschatological situation. Herein lies Paul's conception of his apostolate. As Fridrichsen says,

> A unique 'revelation of the glory of God in the face of Christ' has been given to him. . . . This vision made him an apostle to the gentiles, endowing him with his gospel, τὸ εὐαγγελίον μου, ημῶν, which he had to preach to promote obedience of faith among all the Gentiles, ἐν πάσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν .[3]

The reason for Paul's description of his apostolic task in prophetic terms lies precisely here. Paul's 'gospel,'

---

[1]Ibid., p. 8. [2]Ibid., p. 15. [3]Ibid., p. 16.

which proclaimed that faith, not circumcision, was essential for salvation necessitated a new orientation to the law. As we saw in chapter 2 one of the most prevalent conceptions of the eschatological prophetic function in the Intertestamental Literature was that of the interpretation of the law. Paul, adopting this view and believing that he lived in the messianic age, describes his own particular apostolic role in prophetic terms; he conceived of his apostleship as having a particular responsibility for a re-interpretation of the law.

The central place which the law held in Paul's thinking can hardly be overestimated. As Gerhardsson says: "To judge from the evidence, he seems to have been the personality in early Christianity who had to wrestle hardest with this problem (of the νομος), as he tried to find a solution during his work as an Apostle of Christ."[1] Paul asserts that the law, in the sense that observing it can effect salvation, has had its day. In one passage he states: "Christ is the end of the law for all who have faith" (Rom. 10:4) and in another: "You are not under the law but under grace" (Rom. 6:14). As we sought to show in the last chapter, it is not the law, in and of itself, which Paul opposes. His main point is that the law is not the source of salvation which Judaism maintained. In his extended statement regarding God's plan of salvation and his mission as an apostle to the gentiles, Paul seems to identify himself with

---

[1]Birger Gerhardson, Memory and Manuscript, trans. Eric J. Sharpe (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), p. 310.

the persecuted prophets, especially Elijah (Rom. 11:3ff.). In verse six he makes it clear that grace, not works, i.e. works based on the law, is decisive for membership in the redeemed community. Apparently Paul relates the ideas of being an apostle to the gentiles and a new understanding of the law and the concept of being a prophet who must suffer for his work.

That Paul saw his role as closely connected to the reappraisal of the law is shown in II Cor. 3 where the Apostle draws a contrast between the old and new covenants, between the law of Moses and the law of the Spirit. He points out that the "written code kills, but the Spirit gives life" (v. 6) and compares the glory of the two covenants. The background of Paul's thinking is most likely Exodus 34 which is a description of Moses who, after receiving the Torah from Yahweh on Sinai, descends from the mountain. Moses' face shone with the glory of God with such intensity that the Hebrews could not bear to look at his face, and he put a veil over it. Paul asserts that the glory of the new covenant far exceeds that of the old covenant. In the first place the glory of the old covenant is fading away. In the second place Christ has lifted the veil. As Gerhardsson writes: ". . . the veil is taken away in Christ. When the Jews are converted to Christ, the veil is removed . . . the doxa of God shines forth. Those who have the ministry of the new Covenant, ἔχοντες τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην,

are able to present an unveiled message."[1] In other words, Christ reveals the true nature and will of God which lies behind the Torah.

It must be noted that in the first verses of this chapter Paul identifies himself with the new covenant. After referring to the Corinthians as a letter of recommendation he writes: "and you show that you are an epistle of Christ's delivered by us (ἐπιστολὴ χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν) written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of humans hearts." It is obvious that Paul has in mind a contrast between the law of Moses written on stone and the new covenant which, according to Jeremiah 31:33, would be written on the heart. Scholars differ as to the nature of Paul's role in this process. Davies holds that Paul, himself, wrote Christ, in the sense that he is the new Torah, on the hearts of the Corinthians.[2] Lietzmann maintains that Christ wrote the letter, and Paul only delivered it.[3] Hering understands that it was dictated by Christ, and Paul wrote and delivered it.[4] Filson probably has the best interpretation. He writes:

> Possibly the word (διακονηθεῖσα) includes the idea that the letter was delivered by Paul, since he brought the

---

[1]Ibid., p. 286. [2]Davies, Paul. . . ., pp. 225-226.

[3]Hans Lietzmann, An die Korinther I/II (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck, 1949), p. 110.

[4]Jean Hering, La Seconde Epitre de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens (Paris: Delachaux & Niestle' S. A., 1958), p. 110.

> gospel to Corinth. But before they had believed, the Corinthians were not Christian, and so were not a letter of Christ; thus the meaning seems to be not that he brought the gospel to their city, but that in preaching and converting them Paul was the scribe or agent of Christ, who was the 'author' of their salvation.[1]

The point is that Paul presents himself as one who is active in the work of the new covenant as opposed to the law of Moses. He states this unequivocally in verse 6 when he says that God "has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant not in written code but in the Spirit." Discussing this verse earlier in this chapter we noted that διάκονος is a parallel term to δοῦλος which is almost a technical designation for the Old Testament prophets. By calling himself a διάκονος Paul draws attention to his prophetic understanding of his task. It is apparent that Paul saw that his role as an apostle of Christ to the gentiles involved a reappraisal of the law, and because interpretation of the law was considered one of the prophetic functions in the messianic age, he spoke of his apostleship in prophetic terms.

Paul did not only announce that the law of Moses was no longer binding for salvation, he also stated unequivocally that he was "under the law of Christ" (I Cor. 9:21) and constantly reminded Christians of their responsibility to "walk according to the Spirit" and "fulfill the law of Christ" (Gal. 6:2).

---

[1]Floyd V. Filson, "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. X, Ed. George A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1953), 303.

For Paul the law of Christ took its meaning from the life and death of Jesus Christ and can be summarized as the law of love. As we have seen in previous discussions it was this law which the Apostle sought to interpret in concrete terms as he reminded his congregations of their ethical responsibilities.

In this chapter we have seen that, although Paul does not specifically state that he is a prophet, he thought of himself in prophetic terms. Describing his apostleship and defending his legitimate apostolic claims, Paul seems consciously to attribute to himself phrases and appellations which belong to the prophets. We sought to show that Paul chose these particular terms, because they were appropriately descriptive of his peculiar work as an Apostle of Christ. His task involved, among other things, a presentation of a new understanding of the law: on the one hand he announced that the old law was not binding for redemption; on the other hand he declared that one who was a Christian, who was 'in Christ,' must fulfill the law of Christ. It was Paul's role as interpreter of the law of Christ which prompted him to describe his apostleship in prophetic terms. Paul, like the Old Testament prophets, sought to interpret the will and purpose of God to his people. Paul, unlike the Old Testament prophets, sought to interpret the will and purpose of God as it had been supremely revealed in Jesus Christ to his people. He conceived of himself as the prophet-apostle of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER V

PROPHECY AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

In the third chapter we sought to establish that, for Paul, the Holy Spirit is not only an active force in the Christian life but, also, its norm. Since the Christian lives 'between the times' he requires a norm, a set of guidelines, a law which is consistent with the future age. Because the Spirit is the power of the future age, which is available now, Paul expresses the ethical norm of the present Christian life as the 'walk according to the Spirit.' At other times he refers to it as the 'law of Christ' or as the 'law of love.' The ethical norm of the Christian life is expressed in general, all-inclusive terms; if the general principle is to be valid for particular situations it must be spelled out in concrete terms. In this chapter we must note again the close relationship of prophecy and the Holy Spirit and attempt to show that, for the Apostle, one of the most important tasks of the prophet was to interpret in concrete terms what the 'walk according to the Spirit' or the 'law of Christ' or the 'law of love' meant in the particular situations of the Christian life. We shall focus on I Corinthians 14, which is Paul's only extensive treatment of prophecy.

The Occasion of First Corinthians

The letter in which Paul's discussion of prophecy appears is an excellent example of the need for ethical guidance in the primitive church. First Corinthians gives us a vivid picture of the misunderstanding and misuse of Christian freedom. Throughout the letter Paul insists that there is a Christian way to express their Christian freedom. Barrett says: "From the Corinthian epistles . . . we gain the most complete and many sided picture of how Paul believed that his theological convictions should be expressed in the life of the Church."[1] I Corinthians, which is concerned almost wholly with immediate, practical problems which plagued the church,[2] serves as an important source for Paul's application of his ethical norm to specific difficulties which had actually arisen. Moffatt says:

> In one aspect this document marks the beginning of Christian 'casuistry' in the true sense of that term, i.e., the application of Christian principles to special cases and particular problems arising out of private life and Church situations, such as sex, social ties, discipline and worship.[3]

---

[1]C. K. Barrett, "Christianity at Corinth," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XLVI (1964), 269.

[2]Cf. Ernst von Dobschutz, Christian Life in the Primitive Church, trans. George Bremner, ed. W. D. Morrison (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), pp. 11-80.

[3]James Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians of Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper & Bros., 1938), p. xxvii.

In I Corinthians the Apostle is answering specific questions which the Corinthians addressed to him in a letter (7:1); he is also dealing with moral and factional problems about which 'Chloe's people' (1:11), Stephanus, Fortunatus and Achaicus (16:17) had informed him. Apparently, the issues and problems at Corinth were more numerous and diverse than at any other of his churches. They include the following: factions within the church (1:10-4:21); flagrant immorality by one of the members of the congregation (5:1-8); litigation by Christians in pagan courts (6:1-11); loose sex practices (6:12-20); questions concerning marriage (7:1-40); the eating of meat sacrificed to idols (8:1-11:1); the proper head attire for men and women at public worship (11:2-16); disorderly conduct at the celebration of the Lord's Supper (11:17-34); spiritual gifts (12:1-14:10); the meaning of resurrection faith (15); and the collection for the Jerusalem church (16). From this list, which is a brief outline of the entire letter, it is obvious that the young Christian community is far from ideal. It had failed to "realize the practical implications of the new faith in the conduct of life."[1] Guidance for participation in the 'new life' was desperately needed.

---

[1]T. W. Manson, "The Message of the Epistles--I Corinthians," Expository Times, XLIV (1932-33), 501.

The Context of Paul's Discussion of Prophecy

Paul's discussion of prophecy is embedded in his treatment of spiritual gifts, which is prompted by his concern for their improper use in the worship service. He begins his discussion of public worship in chapter 11. In the first half of the chapter Paul discusses the correct head covering for men and women who pray or prophesy in the public meetings. In the last half of the chapter he warns the Corinthians about the improper observance of the Lord's Supper. Apparently, some participants did not wait for everyone to arrive before eating and drinking. The result: the congregation enjoyed no fellowship together. The body of Christ was profaned (11:27). "A congregation which does not eat . . . in real fellowship is not able to celebrate the Lord's Supper in the right way."[1] Paul commands: "My brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another" (11:33).

In chapter 12 Paul begins his discussion περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν (about the things concerning the Spirit). The first verse reveals that the Apostle is confronted with ignorance as to the true significance of the spiritual gifts or powers which they had experienced. From chapter 14 it appears that some of the Corinthians were claiming too much for 'speaking in tongues.' Apparently they felt it was a

---

[1]Eduard Schweizer, "The Service of Worship," Interpretation, XIII (1959), 401.

special dispensation of the Holy Spirit and that those who possessed it deserved a higher position in the community. The result was confused and disorderly meetings. Paul reminds the Corinthians that it was the Spirit of God working in them, which prompted them to confess that "Jesus is Lord," and all who confess that "Jesus is Lord" have received the Spirit.

The verses which follow are, as M. Barth refers to them, "a Magna Charta of diversity within unity and unity within diversity."[1] In verses 4-11 Paul states that the great varieties of gifts seen in the life of the church are all from the same Spirit, as the varieties of service are from the same Lord and as the varieties of carrying them out are from the same God. According to verse seven each member of the congregation has a particular gift from the Spirit which is for the common good of the entire community. Von Campenhausen points out that the all-giving Spirit becomes concrete in the variety of the different personally bestowed gifts. He writes:

> Paulus kennt keine Wirkung des Geistes in gestaltloser Allgemeinheit und beliebiger Vertauschbarkeit; sondern der eine hat diese, der andere jene Gabe empfangen, so dass das Leben der Kirche immer nur im Zusammenspiel verschiedener geistlicher Vermögen in Erscheinung tritt, die einander erganzen

---

[1] Markus Barth, "A Chapter on the Church--the Body of Christ," Interpretation XII (1958), 131.

> gerade so die Fülle und Einmütigkeit des Christusgeistes offenbaren.[1]

The gifts manifested in the church have a common origin and serve a common purpose.

In verses 12-31 Paul develops the idea of unity of diversity further with his illustration of the church as the body of Christ. Although the imagery varies, the idea of the church as the body of Christ appears in other passages of the Pauline letters, e.g., in Rom. 12:5 we read: "so we, though many, are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another."[2] The point of this passage is to remind the congregation that the diversity which they are experiencing is not foreign to, but a part of, God's will and purpose. Paul says: "But as it is, God arranged the organs in the body, each one of them, as he chose" (v. 18). Barth comments:

> Each member has its being and function only from and in the body (vs. 15-18); God has taken care of each single member in such a way that its fellow members require and recognize its service and dignity, and that all members, the whole body, share in the same misery or joy (vss. 19-26).[3]

---

[1]Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953), p. 61.

[2]Cf. also I Cor. 10:17; Col. 1:18; 2:19.

[3]Barth, op. cit., p. 132.

In the last verses of this chapter Paul explicitly applies what he has been saying to the Corinthian congregation "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it" (v. 27), pointing out that different people have been appointed to specific tasks. To drive his point home he asks: 'can every member perform every function?' The obvious answer is 'No,' and the point is clear: to crush the pride of those who feel superior or independent because of their particular gift. The same Spirit gives every gift for the common purpose, the good of the church. No member has any cause for boasting.

Relation of Chapters 12 and 14 to 13

Chapter 12 closes with an admonition and a promise, "But earnestly desire the higher gifts. And I will show you a still more excellent way." The crucial question is whether this introduces chapter 13 or chapter 14. Scholars disagree in their opinion.[1] Weiss holds that chapter 13 is out of place between 12 and 14. He raises the question as to why Paul, after admonishing members of the congregation to be content with their particular gift, urges them to higher gift. Why, in 14:1, does Paul return to the argument

---

[1]Cf. Jack T. Sanders, "First Corinthians 13," Interpretation, XX (1966), pp. 159-187 for a thorough treatment of this problem and the interpretation of chapter 13 since World War I. The following discussion is dependent on this article.

of chapter 12, after his discussion of ἀγάπη?[1] "Es läge also eigentlich nur der Gedanke vor: weil Liebe das Höchste ist, so strebt nach der Prophetie, weil diese die Gemeinde fördert! Aber 14:1 sagt das nicht, stellt vielmehr ἀγάπη und πνευματικά als zwei erstrebenswerte Dinge neben einander, ohne dass zwischen ἀγάπη und προφητεύειν eine Verbindungslinie gezogen würde."[2] In reality 13:2 deprecates prophecy and would appear to argue against such an interpretation of chapter 14. Also 12:31 causes one to expect that what follows will be a description of a better way for reaching the goals at which the spiritual gifts aimed. However, Weiss says, chapter 13 is not a description of such a way since ἀγάπη is not a charism. Because 8:1ff. and 13:8-13 are related in content, Weiss believes that chapter 13 belongs after chapter 8. Its present position is attributed to the shuffling of pages either before or after the collection of Paul's letters. He concludes his discussion with: "Jedenfalls ist es nützlich, einmal Kap. 13 ohne Rücksicht auf seinen heutigen Zusammenhang mit Kap. 12.14 su betrachten; denn es ist unter allen Umständen ein in sich völlig gescholssenes abgerundetes Stück."[3]

Héring agrees with Weiss that "chapter 13 did not originally occupy its present place in the Epistle."[4] He argues,

---

[1]D. Johannes Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), p. 309.

[2]Ibid., p. 310. [3]Ibid., p. 311.

[4]Jean Héring, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, trans. from second edition by A. W. Heathcote & P. J. Allcock (London: Epworth Press, 1962), p. 134.

like Weiss, that it obviously interrupts the discussion on spiritual gifts. He attributes 12:31b and 14:1a to the work of a redactor who inserted chapter 13. Héring goes so far as to say that chapter 13 is "quite unrelated to chapters 12 and 14."[1] He raises the question as to whether or not chapter 13 belongs to another letter, but he finds no valid reason for doubting its Pauline origin.

Titus also agrees with Weiss and Héring that chapter 13 did not originally belong in its present position.[2] He points out that the subject matter of chapters 12 and 14 is that of disorder in the worship services due to the possession of spiritual gifts. Prophecy is the highest of the spiritual gifts. "Chapter 14 is a treatise on the superiority of prophecy on the ground that it edifies."[3] Titus asserts: "If chapter 13 is omitted, the treatment of gifts in chapters 12 and 14 becomes a unity in terms of a hierarchy of values within the list itself."[4] He also attributes 12:31b and 14:1a to a redactor. Titus goes beyond Héring and Weiss in that he raises serious questions about the authenticity of chapter 13. He points to the lack of Christology, the playing down of faith, the uniqueness of form of this chapter when compared with other Pauline writings. In the last paragraph

---

[1] Ibid., p. 134.

[2] Eric L. Titus, "Did Paul Write I Cor. 13?" Journal of Bible and Religion, XXVII (1959), 299-302.

[3] Ibid., p. 300.

[4] Ibid., p. 300.

of his article Titus damns chapter 13 with faint praise:

> In any case, the interpolation, if such it is, has served its purpose well. After reading the inspiring panegyric on love, the force of chapter 14 with its stress on prophecy is lost to the average reader, so that he scarcely knows that it is there at all.[1]

Sanders maintains that the original position of I Cor. 13 was after chapter 14. He agrees with Héring that 12:31b and 14:1a are glosses added by a redactor, and with Weiss and Héring, that chapter 13 interrupts the discussion of chapters 12 and 14. At the same time he agrees with the majority of exegetes who contend that chapter 13 must be understood in connection with chapters 12 and 14.[2] His clue for determining the original position of chapter 13 lies in what he considers a progressive development of thought in 12 and 14. "There is a definite movement in these two chapters from the lowest to the highest charism."[3] Seen in this way 12:31b, "And I will show you a still more excellent way," belongs after 14:40. "And does not chapter 13 then precisely give an explanation of Christian existence which surmounts and surpasses the previous discussion, by showing the relativity not only of glossolalia but also of prophecy?"[4] This interpretation would also explain 'noisy gong' and 'clanging

---

[1] Ibid., p. 302. [2] Cf. Infra.

[3] Sanders, op. cit., p. 183.

[4] Ibid., p. 183.

cymbal' in 13:1; "for Paul would then already have compared glossolalia to musical instruments in 14:7-9, emphasizing that the instruments must give a definite note, something glossolalia does not. The point of 13:1 would then be precisely that the instruments here do not give notes."[1] We shall return to Sanders' interpretation, but this will suffice to indicate his reasoning for placing chapter 13 after 14.

Other scholars accept the present position of 13 as the original one. The problem of position is solved by the close relationship of content of all three chapters. Robertson and Plummer refer to chapter 13 as a digression. However, although a digression, the chapter "is yet a step in the treatment of the subject of spiritual gifts and forms itself a complete and beautiful whole."[2]

Schweizer asserts that the contention of Weiss and Héring is highly improbable. He writes: "For in Romans 12:3ff. the apostle discusses in a similar way the concept of the church as the body of Christ and the mutual services rendered by the different gifts of the Spirit. And just like

---

[1] Ibid., p. 184.

[2] Archibald Robertson & Alfred Plummer, First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians of International Critical Commentary (2nd. ed. rev.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1961), p. 285.

I Cor. 12-13 this leads to the call to 'agape,' to loving one another (Rom. 12:9f.-13:8-10)."[1]

Craig refers to I Cor. 13 as the "high point in Paul's description of the Christian life."[2] He dismisses the problem of authorship and position by saying that a close examination of the chapter reveals "that almost every word in the chapter has been chosen with this particular situation at Corinth in mind."[3]

Stagg[4] and Manson[5] agree that, since love is the key to I Corinthians, the thirteenth chapter is an integral and indispensable part of the entire book. For Hurd the crux of the problem is the extent to which chapters 12 and 14 share a unity of purpose.[6] After a careful study he concludes that there is a striking unity of purpose in these three chapters. "The three chapters form one long attack upon the notion that speaking in tongues was the single or the best manifestation of the Spirit at work in the Church."[7]

---

[1]Schweizer, "The Service. . . . ," p. 404.

[2]Clarence T. Craig, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible Vol. X, ed. Geo. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953), p. 165.

[3]Ibid., p. 165.

[4]Frank Stagg, "The Motif of First Corinthians," Southwestern Journal of Theology, III (1960), 15-24.

[5]Manson, "The Message. . . . ," pp. 500-504.

[6]John C. Hurd, The Origin of I Corinthians (New York: Seabury Press, 1965), pp. 181-183.

[7]Ibid., p. 192.

Johansson approaches the problem by dealing with the particular relationship between chapters 13 and 14.[1] He sets forth his thesis: "I Cor. 13 is the fundamental basis on which Paul's criticism and admonitions rest, when he proceeds to deal with the church's mistakes."[2] Johansson recognizes that chapter 13 alludes, to some extent, to the two preceding chapters, but he maintains that "its main purpose is to justify what is to be said in chapter 14."[3] He points out that in chapter 14 Paul repeats ideas, images, and expressions of chapter 13 and applies them to conditions found in the Corinthian church. Chapter 14, which shows Paul's preference for prophecy, which builds up the community, over speaking in tongues, which is a selfish undertaking, illustrates the theme of chapter 13 which says that ἀγάπη is never selfish. The last paragraph of this article reveals a contradiction in Johansson's argument. He does not place prophecy on the side of ἀγάπη but opposed to it. He says: "When Paul sets up the commands of ἀγάπη against speaking with tongues, prophecy and gnosis, he knows that he is setting up something objective, permanent and complete against the pneumatic experiences, which are often subjective and determined by

---

[1] Nils Johansson, "I Cor. 13 & I Cor. 14," New Testament Studies, X (1963-1964), 383-392.

[2] Ibid., p. 390. [3] Ibid.

human fancies and wishes."[1] This negates the high position of prophecy which Johansson earlier attributes to it.

We must agree with those scholars who maintain that chapter 13 stands in its original position, because it fits in with the theme of the entire book and particularly with that of 12 and 14. Johansson's assertion that chapter 13 is the "basis on which Paul's criticism and admonitions rest" cannot be denied. However, on these grounds chapter 13 could legitimately precede any of Paul's hortatory statements.

For this study it is important to show that Paul had a definite purpose for placing his discussion of love just prior to his only extensive treatment of prophecy. The question regarding the relationship of love and prophecy must be considered. The clue is to be found in Paul's concept of the Holy Spirit, which is closely related to both. More precisely, the clue is found in Paul's concept of the Holy Spirit as the ethical norm of the Christian life. As we saw Paul sometimes refers to this norm as the 'walk according to the Spirit,' sometimes the 'law of Christ' or the 'law of love.' This over-all principle demands interpretation for particular situations. It is the thesis of this dissertation that, for Paul, one of the primary functions of prophecy, so closely identified with the Holy Spirit, is to interpret the law of love and provide guidance in concrete terms for action when

---

[1] Ibid., p. 392.

particular ethical problems arise. To see if this thesis is correct we shall consider chapters 13 and 14 in the light of what has been said regarding Paul's concept of the Holy Spirit as the ethical norm for the Christian life.

Chapter 13--The Law of Love

I Cor. 12:31b, 'and yet I am showing you (or making known to you) a more excellent way (ὁδόν) (καὶ ἔτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι), serves as a transition from chapter 12 to 13. Paul's use of ὁδός is significant, because he apparently adopts the figurative meaning which it carries in the Old Testament of bearing, manner of living, a way of acting, or conduct of one's life.[1] Burnier points out that the expression 'ways of God' is often found in the Old Testament in reference to his activity (Deut. 32:4; cf. Acts. 13:10), his manner of acting (Isa. 55:80), his designs (Isa. 58:2; cf. Rom. 11:33).[2] There are also the ways in which God commands men to walk (Jer. 7:23; Ps. 25:4), the commandments of the law (Deut. 8:6). In Ps. 119:1-11 the way of those who walk in the law, the statutes, the commandments, of the Lord is blameless. The term 'way' is often found in the preaching

---

[1] Cf. Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), pp. 556-557.

[2] J. Burnier, "The Way," A Companion to the Bible, ed. J. J. von Allmen (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 446.

of the prophets, who urged the people of Israel to turn back from their evil ways (II Kg. 17:13; Zech. 1:4; Jonah 3:8, 10) and amend their ways (Jer. 7:3, 5; 26:13). According to Jer. 32:39 God will give his children the way they should go.

The Dead Sea Scrolls indicate that the Qumran sect believed that they had been called to walk in the particular way of God. IQS iii.18 explicitly refers to the members of the Qumran community as "those who choose the way."[1] After discussing this idea at considerable length and pointing to numerous references to support his view Kosmala concludes:

> Aus den vorangehenden Bemerkungen, die wir im einzelnen noch weiterfuhren konnten, geht hervor, dass 'der Weg (Gottes)' als Selbstbezeichnung der Sektenreligion in engem Anschluss an die biblische Überlieferung gewahlt ist, wobei die Beziehung zum Vertrauen und die Hoffnung auf Gott immer wieder zum Ausdruck kommt.[2]

In the New Testament also ὁδός is used in the figurative sense. Jesus uses it when he speaks of the way of life of those who follow him (Mt. 7:13-14). John the Baptist is referred to as coming in the way of righteousness (Mt. 21:32) and Jesus as teaching the way of God (Mt. 22:16). In Acts the term is found without any qualification as a designation for Christians (Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23; 24:14, 22). Burnier

---

[1] William H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies, nos. 10-12 (1951), 37 f.n. 34.

[2] Hans Kosmala, Hebraer-Essener-Christen (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959), p. 334.

observes that this particular use seems to be derived from the expression 'the way of the Lord.' "In a very general manner it must denote Christianity as a movement. . . ."[1]

Paul's use of ὁδός in various contexts makes it clear that he understands the term figuratively as the way of conducting one's life.[2] He uses it in Rom. 3:17 where he quotes Isa. 59:8. Michaelis comments that it clearly refers to a way of life, by which one tries to live in peace with one's surroundings.[3] At times Paul apparently has in mind a manner of life which has particular characteristics which he has taught. Earlier in Corinthians (4:17) he writes that he is sending Timothy to remind the concregation of his ways in Christ as he teaches them everywhere in every church. Michaelis suggests that behind the expression ὁδοί μου stands the Old Testament αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ κυρίου meaning the way of life which the Lord has instructed his people to take. He writes:

---

[1]Burnier, op. cit., p. 447.

[2]Cf. chapter three, passim, where περιπατέω, walk, which is closely related to ὁδός and is used frequently by Paul in talking about the Christian life, is discussed. Cf. also Rom. 6:4; 8:4; 13:13; I Cor. 3:3; 7:17; II Cor. 4:2; 5:7; 10:2, 3; 12:18; Gal. 5:16; Phil. 3:17, 18; Col. 2:6; 4:5; I Th. 4:1, 12; II Th. 3:6, 11.

[3]Wilhelm Michaelis, "ὁδός," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (2nd. ed. rev., ed. G. Friedrich; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag), V (1954), 88.

> Insofern im AT bei ὁδός die Bdtg. das (auf den Wandel des Menschen sich beziehende) Gebot her vortritt und ὁδός fast synonym zu ἐντολή wird, ist die Frage nahegelegt, ob auch I K 4, 17 diese Bdtg anzunehmen ist: αἱ ὁδοί μου = meine Gebote, Grundsätze, Regeln. Es hindert nichts, diese Frage zu bejahen.[1]

Hering would agree, because he asserts that αἱ ὁδοί "means moral principles rather like the word halacha in Hebrew."[2]

It must be stressed that Paul uses the phrase 'my ways in Christ' which means that his ways are rooted and grounded in Christ. A parallel use of μου is found when Paul refers to 'my gospel' (Rom. 2:16). As we saw in the last chapter Paul is preaching God's gospel, but with his own particular emphasis. The point is that when Paul uses ὁδοὶ μου he means a way of conducting one's life which he teaches. He sets forth what it means to live 'in Christ.'

Paul also uses ὁδός in I Th. 3:11 where the Apostle prays that God "may direct our way to you." Most scholars understand ὁδός concretely as Paul's prayer for a revisit to Thessalonica.[3] This seems to be a possible interpretation

---

[1] Ibid., p. 92; cf. Birger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, trans. Eric J. Sharpe (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), p. 304 for a discussion of the idea that Paul had definite ethical tractates which he taught.

[2] Héring, op. cit., p. 32. It should be noted that the word halacha denotes 'walking' and is the term used in Rabbinic Literature for the rules and regulations for living in conformity with the Torah. Halacha provided a definite code of action for Jews to follow.

[3] James Everett Frame, Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians of International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh:

since verse 10 states that Paul has been praying that he might see them face to face and supply what is lacking in their faith. However, a figurative interpretation seems preferable. The δέ of verse 11 introduces a new section and indicates that the entire verse belongs with the verses which follow rather than with those which precede. This idea is strengthened by the fact that Paul begins his explicit exhortation in the next chapter which follows immediately. "Finally, brethren, we beseech and exhort you in the Lord Jesus, that as you learned from us how you ought to live and to please God, just as you are doing, you do so more and more. For you know what instructions we gave you through the Lord Jesus." Nowhere else does Paul use ὁδός concretely. If we can assume that ὁδός means here, as elsewhere in Paul's writings, a way of living, verse 12 becomes a definition of what Paul considers ἡμῶν ὁδός; it is the way of "love to one another and to all men."

This interpretation parallels Paul's meaning in I Cor. 12:31b where he introduces his statement on love as the more excellent way. The Apostle's use of ὁδός in the midst of his discussion of spiritual gifts indicates that love is somehow

---

T. & T. Clark, 1912), pp. 136-137; E. J. Bicknell, The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians of Westminster Commentaries (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1932), p. 35; William Neil, "I & II Thessalonians," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., 1962), p. 998.

different from the other gifts. It is a gift (God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit, Rom. 5:5; cf. Rom. 15:30; Gal. 5:22), but it is also the way, the description of that which constitutes the Christian life. In order for any other gifts to be Christian they must be based on and grow out of love. Only love can determine the value of any gift. Bouttier says: ". . . they (the spiritual gifts) have a common denominator which relates them to each other, and makes each of them a grace to the profit of all--and that common feature, that constituent, is love."[1] This is evident from 13:1-3. Sanders says: ". . . verses 1-3 have the effect of explaining that agape is that which makes existence Christian--that no deeds, however splendid, are Christian unless they are rooted and grounded in agape and that existence is therefore Christian only where agape is present."[2]

Verses 4-7 depict the character of agape. This description, no doubt, is a contrast to the behavior of the Corinthians which Paul is condemning. Robertson and Plummer write: "Every one of the moral excellences which he [Paul] enumerates tells, for they are no mere abstractions, but are based on experience, and are aimed at the special faults

---

[1]Michel Bouttier, Christianity According to Paul, trans. Frank Clark (London: S. C. M. Press, 1966), p. 86.

[2]Sanders, op. cit., p. 184.

exhibited by the Corinthians."[1] However, it is more than a contrast with the Corinthian behavior; it is a description of the new life of the Christian in contrast to that of the pre-Christian man. Although the descriptive words of Gal. 5:16-26, which contrast the walk by the Spirit with that of the flesh, are not identical with those of this passage, it is clear that PAul has the same idea in mind. Love dominates the new life lived in the Spirit, in Christ, which stands in complete contrast to the pre-Christian life, lived according to the flesh.

Barth's interpretation of I Cor. 13 is helpful at this point.[2] He believes that chapters 13 and 15 are essentially talking about the same thing--eschatology. In chapter 13 eschatology is regarded from the standpoint of what man can do; in chapter 15 eschatology is regarded from the standpoint of what God can do. However, commenting on chapter 13 Barth guards against justification by works when he says: ". . . in truth, if 13:1-8 be read intelligently, it cannot fail to be apparent that this human possibility is just God's possibility for man."[3] Love is an eschatological reality (that which remains when all else ceases v.8) made available now;

---

[1] Robertson & Plummer, op. cit., p. 392.

[2] Karl Barth, The Resurrection of the Dead, trans. H. J. Stenning (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1933).

[3] Ibid., p. 77.

it is "the divine possibility in all human possibilities."[1] The eschatological event of love, Barth says, is best seen in verses 4-7 where "love is described in a series of sentences that have a mainly negative purport, (that is) a certain indication that the last things, which can only be described via negativa, are in the immediate vicinity."[2] Here is a description of "the really concrete man, apart from what he is in Christ. He cannot have patience, but it can."[3] For Barth, agape is the Pauline expression of the death to the old life and rising to new life in Christ.

Bultmann agrees with Barth that Paul is talking about eschatology in chapter 13.[4] However, he goes beyond Barth who maintains that in chapter 15 Paul deals more explicitly with eschatology than in 13. Bultmann asserts that Paul speaks of the 'last things' as 'reality in the life of Christians' in chapter 13 and he speaks of the 'last things' as an 'object of speculation' in chapter 15. For Bultmann, eschatology, in its meaning for present existence, is the subject matter of I Cor. 13; for this reason it is the high point of the entire letter. He writes:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 88. [2] Ibid., p. 90. [3] Ibid.

[4] Rudolf Bultmann, "Karl Barth, 'Die Auferstehung der Toten,'" Glauben Und Verstehen, Vol. I (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933), pp. 33-64.

> In Gottes Urteil sind wir die Gerecthfertigen, und die 'allerletzte Möglichkeit,' dass dies zur Wirklichkeit in unserem zeitlichen Leben wird, ist die αγάπη. Sofern der erste Korintherbrief nicht vom Thema des rechtfertigenden Glaubens geleitet ist, sondern vom Thema des zeitlichen Lebens der Gläubigen, ist K. 13 sein eigentlicher Höhepunkt.[1]

Even though Barth and Bultmann disagree in their view of chapter 15, both rightly see that Paul, in 13:4-7, speaks of love as that which belongs to the world to come, but is a present reality in Christian existence.

In the last section of chapter 13 the futuristic eschatological aspect of love is emphasized. In verse 8 we read: ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε πίπτει (love never ends). Spicq, in a thorough word study, makes it clear that πίπτει does not denote moral failure (as King James Version infers).[2] Used in its literal sense it refers to a person, animal or thing which falls to the ground and collapses. Used in a figurative sense it refers to a fallen, ruined people or dynasty. Spicq points out: "The verb πίπτω has two synonyms in the New Testament, καταργέω, 'to abolish, destroy, make ineffective' and παύω, 'to cease, stop, finish."[3] In this context it is obvious that Paul uses πίπτω in the sense of 'cessation,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 64.

[2] Ceslaus Spicq, Agape in the New Testament, Vol. II, trans. Sister Marie Acquaina McNamara & Sister Mary Honoria Richter (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1965), p. 160.

[3] Ibid., p. 160.

being wiped out, dropping out of existence.' Verses 8-12 present an antithesis between that which will perish, i.e. the other spiritual gifts such as prophecy, glossolalia and knowledge, and that which will endure. Among these gifts, love alone will remain in the world to come. As Barth says: ". . . it [love] is, in 13:12, placed in relation to seeing God face to face which will take place in the beyond of all time, in the eschatological 'then.'"[1]

In verses 11 and 12 we see the eschatological tension of the Christian life. The analogy of the child becoming a man marks the move from the pre-Christian to the Christian life. In verse 12 Paul describes the 'already' and the 'not yet' of Christian existence. ἄρτι (now), as a man, as a Christian, I see but I have an indistinct and limited vision, which a mirror affords. Findlay points out that when Paul says δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι ". . . it is the dimness, not the displacement, of the image that he is thinking of."[2] Such a view is a blurred reflection; it presents objects ἐν αἰνίγματι (enigmatically), ". . . in [the shape of] a riddle rather than a full intelligible view."[3] What we see

---

[1]Barth, op. cit., p. 76.

[2]G. G. Findlay, "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians," The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. II, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (New York: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., nd.), p. 901.

[3]Ibid., p. 901.

now (in the present age) in a limited, indistinct way, we shall see then (in the future age) completely and clearly, face to face. Now as a man, as a Christian, we know partially; then, in the future age, we will know exactly, completely, through and through. Love will never end. It, like the Holy Spirit, which belongs to the future age, has invaded the present age, but is only partially realized now. In the future age it will be fully realized.

Verse 13, "So now remains faith, hope, love, all these three, the greatest of these is love," is problematical. The primary question is whether Paul means that faith, hope, love will continue in the world to come or only until the end of the present age. Does he mean that only love belongs to the future age? Are we to give νυνὶ δὲ (and now) a logical meaning, i.e., therefore, in short, or a temporal meaning, i.e. now, in the present life? Scholars take both positions. Some assert that it is the quality of eternity, of enduring into the world to come, which makes love superior to faith and hope which belong to this age only.[1] Sanders rightly

---

[1]D. Hans Lietzmann, An die Korinther I/II (4th ed., sup. by Kummel; Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1949), p. 66, asserts that the νυνί δέ must be taken logically, but, essentially he denies this when he maintains that the superiority of love must be attributed to its quality of eternity, which faith and hope do not share; Héring, op. cit., pp. 143-144 has the same interpretation. He understands the "eulogy of the triad in a present sense, as a contrast to the charismatic gifts" (p. 144). The superiority of agape is explained: ". . . faith and hope . . . will lose their meaning in the consummated world; but this does not apply to agape" (p. 144).

points out that the scholars who take νυνὶ δὲ to be logical rather than temporal have the more convincing argument.[1] νυνὶ δὲ should be translated 'so then' or 'and now' or 'but now.' Paul is not continuing with the antithesis of the present and future, the now and then of the previous verses. As Moffatt says, ". . . in this sentence he sums up the final value of love as the quality which qualifies for the exercise of any spiritual gift."[2] It is the present order of existence about which Paul speaks and in which he includes faith and hope along with love. All three μένει (remain, last, persist, stay alive). As if to underline this quality, Paul adds τὰ τρία ταῦτα (these three) will remain, these three are constant and continual, in contrast to the spiritual gifts which are available now but will pass away. Paul does not appear to have the quality of 'eternity' in mind. Sanders points out that 13:2, 7 imply, and II Cor. 5:17 and Rom. 8:24 state explicitly, that faith and hope will not be a part of the "beyond time."[3] The point is that the quality of time which μένω denotes is equally shared by all three and the superiority of love lies in some other realm than the fact that it is eternal. Love's greatness, for Paul, must be

---

[1]Sanders, op. cit., p. 186.

[2]Moffatt, op. cit., p. 203.

[3]Sanders, op. cit., p. 186.

attributed to something else. As Sanders says: "The fact that he calls αγαπη the 'greatest' shows that its significance in reality lies elsewhere than in its abiding."[1]

Where then does its superiority lie? Robertson and Plummer seem close to the answer when they say: "Love is the root of the other two. . . ."[2] In the last verse of the chapter Paul returns to the thought of the first verses and announces "that no activity of the Spirit, not even faith or hope, avails apart from such love."[3] Love is the basis of all Christian existence. Love is that which makes the Christian life Christian; it is, as Dahl says: "das Wesen des kommenden Aon selbst (13, 7.13), zugleich die Gabe des Geistes (Gal. 5:22) und die Erfüllung des Gesetzes (Rom. 13, 8-10), deswegen auch das Lebenselement der Kirche, des neuen Volkes Gottes."[4] Where love is present the powers of the new age have been released.

Although chapter 13 presents love as a description of the Christian life, there is a sense in which it is an imperative to live in this way. Paul's demand for love is explicitly stated in other passages. In Gal. 5:13 he admonishes his

---

[1] Ibid., p. 187.

[2] Robertson & Plummer, op. cit., p. 300.

[3] Moffatt, op. cit., p. 204.

[4] Nils A. Dahl, Das Volk Gottes (2nd. ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963), p. 229.

readers to be servants of one another through love. The Roman congregation is urged to love one another "for he who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law" (Rom. 13:8). In closing his letter to the Corinthians Paul implores them to do everything in love (16:14). Since Paul's admonition to love is so central throughout his letters it is not too much to say, with Sanders, that 13:4-7 "is a description which contains the implied imperative."[1] Verses 4-7 describe what it means to be in Christ, in the Spirit, in the Christian life. At the same time there is the implied demand to be patient and kind, the demand not to be jealous or boastful, not to be arrogant or rude, not to insist on one's own way, not to rejoice in wrong, but rejoice in right. It seems clear that when Paul introduces chapter 13 as the more excellent way he is presenting love as the prescribed way for the believer.

If 12:31b-13:13 implies the demand of love, 14:1 makes the exhortation explicit. Paul's use of the present imperative, διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην (be pursuing love or seek after intently) the more excellent way, makes it evident that he demands the continuous, constant attempt to walk in the way of love. Here is a definite imperative to conduct one's life according to the norm of love. It is significant that Paul concludes the Corinthian letter with the same imperative:

---

[1] Sanders, op. cit., p. 184.

πάντα υμῶν εν ἀγάπη γινέσθω (let everything you do take place in love, 16:14). No doubt, Paul, finishing the letter, remembers all the ethical problems which plague the congregation. He has dealt with many of them concretely in the letter. His final word to the Corinthians is: if they are in Christ, they must walk in love. Love must determine every act; it must be the deciding factor in solving every ethical problem. Love is the law of the Christian life.

Chapter 14--The Interpreter of the Law of Love

In 14:1 Paul admonishes the Corinthians: "pursue love and continue to desire the spiritual gifts" (διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά). It is important that δέ be translated here as a simple connective, 'and,' because it relates love to the spiritual gifts. As we saw Paul's crucial point in I Cor. 13 was that every action should be rooted and grounded in love. In 14:1 he continues the same argument by dealing specifically with prophecy and the other spiritual gifts.

Although Paul includes all the gifts in his admonition he singles out prophecy as particularly desirable by adding μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε (and especially that you might prophesy). Plummer points out that the ἵνα is definitive, not telic.[1] Since prophecy is counted among the gifts, μᾶλλον

---

[1] Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 305.

must take the sense of 'more than' or 'especially.' It must be concluded that, of all the gifts, prophecy bears some kind of special relationship to love. What is this particular relationship? The context points to an ethical relationship. The connection of both with the Holy Spirit also points to an ethical relationship. As we saw, for Paul, the walk according to the Spirit is identified with the law of love. In the Old Testament and the Intertestamental Literature the voice of prophecy is identified with the voice of the Spirit. One of the primary functions of the prophet of the Old Testament was to pronounce the ethical responsibility of God's people for particular situations. The Intertestamental Literature reveals an expectation of a prophet who will interpret the law for specific problems in concrete terms. Paul's letters reveal that he saw the necessity for interpreting the over-all norm of love and stating concrete admonitions. The fact that he places his only extensive treatment of prophecy immediately after his only prolonged statement regarding love indicates that Paul shared with the intertestamental writers their view that one of the primary tasks of the prophet was to interpret the law. If our thesis is correct a study of chapter 14 should reveal that, for Paul, prophecy is deeply concerned with ethics.

Paul's presentation of prophecy in chapter 14 takes the form of a contrast between it and glossolalia. The reason

for this discussion is evident in chapter 12. Apparently the Corinthians misunderstood the true nature of the spiritual gifts. They confused manifestations of the Holy Spirit with enthusiasm. To them the more miraculous an act appeared the more godly it seemed to be. For the Corinthians, as Schweizer says, ". . . glossolalia was the highest degree of spiritual maturity, just because it showed itself depending on a mysterious power which could not be identified with any natural faculty of man."[1] Paul reminds them that, when they were heathen, they were moved to worship dumb idols by some power (12:2). The crucial test for the work of the Holy Spirit is that whatever is said or done is a proclamation of the lordship of Jesus (12:3). Every gift is given by God for the common good of the church. Every gift is worthless unless it is grounded in love. Every gift should build up the body of Christ.

Every gift should build up the church, but it is a particular characteristic of prophecy that it does this. Paul says: ". . . he who prophesies speaks to men for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation" (I Cor. 14:3). οἰκοδομέω is particularly significant for our study since Paul uses it or its cognates seven times in chapter 14. Also it is precisely with οἰκοδομέω (edify) that the distinction between prophecy and glossolalia is made. "He who speaks in

---

[1]Schweizer, "The Service. . . . ," p. 403.

a tongue edifies himself, but he who prophesies edifies the church" (I Cor. 14:4). What does Paul mean by the word οἰκοδομέω?

According to Bauer-Ardnt-Gingrich there are three uses of οἰκοδομέω: to build in the literal sense, i.e., to erect an edifice; to build in the figurative sense, e.g., Paul refers to continuing the missionary work, started by another Christian, as building on another man's foundation (Rom. 15: 20); and "in a non-literal sense, often without any consciousness of its basic meaning. . . . It=something like benefit, strengthen, establish, as well as edify."[1] It is in the last sense that Paul uses οἰκοδομέω in I Cor. 14. A consideration of the context and message of other passages in which Paul uses the term is helpful.[2]

In I Cor. 8:1 the Apostle says: "Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up" (ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ). This sentence is Paul's introduction to his exhortation regarding the issue of eating meat sacrificed to idols. Vielhauer points out that the 'knowledge' of 8:1 is monotheism, the insight that no idols exist which could damage man (8:4-6). However, this knowledge, although correct in and of itself, is valid

---

[1] Bauer, Ardnt, Gingrich, op. cit., p. 561.

[2] Cf. Philipp Vielhauer, Oikodome (Karlsruhe-Deirbach: Verlagsdruckerei Gebr.-Tron., 1940), pp. 76-121 for a thorough exegetical treatment of all the Pauline passages in which oikodome and its cognates appear.

only when there is love corresponding to it (13:1-3).[1] Verses 7-13 explain what this means in terms of action in the presence of a person who does not fully understand or have the correct knowledge about food sacrificed to idols. Those who have knowledge must act in love, must refrain from any action which might be detrimental to anyone present. It is not the conscience of the stronger one which is to be taken into consideration but the conscience of the weaker one. Paul concludes: "if food is a cause of my brother's falling, I will never eat meat, lest I cause my brother to fall" (8:13). It is clear that the action which edifies is an ethical one.[2]

The same idea occurs in I Cor. 10:23: "all things are lawful, but not all things build up"[3] (πάντα ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει). This verse leads back to chapters 8 and 9 and shares the context of seeking the good of the neighbor in particular situations. Here Paul repeats the principle stated in I Cor. 6:12. Vielhauer points out that Paul may

---

[1] Ibid., p. 93.

[2] Cf. Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, Vol. IV, 2, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1958), pp. 636-638 for a discussion of the significance of οἰκοδομέω for Christian ethics; cf. also Wolfgang Schrage, Die Konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinschen Paränese (Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1961), pp. 256-257.

[3] Cf. I Cor. 6:12.

be referring to a popular slogan in Corinth--πάντα ἔξεστιν (everything is lawful).[1] Paul concedes to the correctness of the statement, per se; however, he looks at it from a different perspective and corrects and modifies it. Everything one does must be considered from the perspective of what is good for the other, for the brother for whom Christ died (8:11). In other words, the law which constrains Paul is the law of love. Love is the norm of the Christian life; at the same time it is the limit of the Christian freedom. Out of love a Christian should seek that which edifies the neighbor.

A form of οἰκοδομέω appears twice in Rom. 14:13-15:6. Again the context is an ethical one; again the issue is eating. The same rule applies: if an action, which is good, i.e. not harmful to the person who does it but is harmful to another, it is against the law of the Christian life. Anything which causes another to fall or stumble is wrong (vv. 20, 21). Vielhauer says: "Nur wenn die Liebe, die Bereitschaft, seine Freiheit darin zu betätigen, dass man sie dem christlichen Bruder offert, in dieser Entfaltung Norm des Gemeindelebens ist, ist das Verhaltnis zu Gott und Bruder in Ordnung" (v. 18).[2] In verse 19 Paul admonishes the Romans to pursue that which makes for peace and for mutual upbuild-

---

[1] Vielhauer, op. cit., p. 95.

[2] Ibid., p. 99.

ing. According to 15:2 that which pleases the neighbor for his good is edifying.

In I Thes. 5:11 Paul admonishes the congregation: "Therefore encourage one another and build up one another, just as you are doing." The διό (therefore) serves to connect this admonishment with the preceding discussion. In the last section of chapter 4 Paul discusses the Parousia, after which he reminds the readers that that time has not yet come. He exhorts them to live in a Christian manner, again using the vocabulary of love and edification. In the midst of this discussion Paul admonishes his readers "to respect those who labor among you and are over you in the Lord, and to esteem them very highly because of their work" (vv. 11-12). These words are reminiscent of I Cor. 14:1 where prophecy is presented as the most desirable among the spiritual gifts. The relationship between I Thes. 5 and I Cor. 14 appears even more distinctly when we note the use of παρακαλέω (I Cor. 14:3; I Thes. 5:11) and παραμυθέομαι (I Cor. 14:3; I Thes. 5:14) in both.

In I Cor. 14:3 Paul says "but the one prophesying speaks to men for edification and exhortation (παράκλησιν) and encouragement (παραμυθίαν)." Παρακαλέω and παραμυθέομαι belong to Paul's ethical vocabulary. It is significant that Paul uses these terms rather than terms of command, because, as we saw in our discussion on the Holy Spirit,

there is a dialectic between the indicative and imperative in the Apostle's thought. Both παρακαλέω and παραμυθέομαι carry the meaning of comfort as well as exhortation.[1] In his discussion of these words Stählin connects this aspect of double meaning to the idea of the indicative/imperative tension found throughout the Pauline letters. He writes: "Die Einheit von Mahnung und Tröstung wurzelt im Evangelium selbst, das Gabe und Aufgabe zugleich ist; sie ist eine der Anwendungsformen des dialektischen Ineinanders von Imerativ und Indikativ im Neuen Testament."[2]

Often Paul uses παρακαλέω in the strictly hortatory sense. Many times he introduces his exhortations with παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς (I exhort you) e.g., Rom. 12:1; II Cor. 10:1; I Thes. 4:1; Phil. 4:2. In I Thes, itself, Paul's use of παρακαλέω, in its hortatory sense, is often illustrated. In 2:11 we read: "We exhorted each of you and encouraged you and charged you to lead a life worthy of God." Again, in 4:11: "We beseech and exhort you in the Lord Jesus, that as you learned from us how you ought to live and to please God. . . ." (cf. 3:2; 4:10). Παραμυθέομαι appears only six times in the

---

[1]D. Otto Schmitz, "Παρακαλέω," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (2nd. ed. rev. ed. G. Friedrich; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag), V (1954), 790-791.

[2]Gustav Stählin, "Παραμυθέομαι," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (2nd. ed. rev. ed. G. Friedrich; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag), V (1954), 819.

New Testament; four of these occur in the Pauline letters. Stählin points out that, with Paul, παρακαλέω is such a central concept that παραμυθέομαι seems only to be a complement to it; in any case they are always related (cf. I Thes. 2:11-12; 5:14; I Cor. 14:3; Phil. 2:1).[1]

The point is that the vocabulary which is common to I Thes. 5 and I Cor. 14 is ethical. It is not too much to say that when Paul urges the Thessalonians to respect and esteem highly those who are over them in the Lord, he is referring to those exercising the prophetic function who, in I Cor. 14, are closely identified with the ethical work of edification and exhortation. This idea is strengthened by the fact that Paul concludes his discussion in I Thes. 5 with the admonition: "Do not quench the Spirit, do not despise prophesying, but test everything; hold fast what is good. . . ." (19-20).

By including the exhortation to test everything with that of not despising prophesying Paul indicates that he conceives of the prophet as one who has words of ethical instruction. Paul uses δοκιμάζω (test) frequently and in almost every case in reference to ethical action. As we shall see below Rom. 12:2; Cor. 1:9-10; Phil. 1:9-10 indicate that the renewal of the mind and testing what is the will of God is the beginning of ethical action. According to I Cor. 3:13-15

---

[1] Ibid.

on the Last Day the fire will test the edifying work which each man has done, and he will be rewarded accordingly. In the midst of the hortatory section of Gal 6:4, after he admonishes his readers to fulfill the law of Christ, Paul urges each man to test his own work (cf. II Cor. 8:8; Rom. 14:22). It is evident that, for Paul, δοκιμάζω as the word for testing has definite ethical connotations. The words of the prophet are to be tested by the congregation as to whether or not they are suitable to the particular situation. The same idea occurs in I Cor. 14:24.

Paul also uses οἰκοδομέω in referring to his own work. In II Cor. 10:8; 12:19; 13:10 he explains that he has been given authority by the Lord for edification (εἰς οἰκοδομήν) for the upbuilding of the Corinthians. As we saw these texts may well be allusions to Jeremiah 1:9-10 as if to emphasize this responsibility as a particular characteristic of the prophet. Paul's sense of responsibility as an apostle to the Gentiles may also stem from another Jeremiah passage in which Yahweh proposes to build up not only his own people but also other nations: "they shall be built up in the midst of my people" (12:16). The ethical implications are seen in the stipulation: "if they will diligently learn the ways of my people." As we have seen, 'way' and 'ways' in the Old Testament denotes a particular manner of conducting one's life.

From this review of οἰκοδομέω, as well as παρακαλέω and παραμυθέομαι, it is clear that all three belong to the Apostle's ethical vocabulary. When Paul says that one who prophesies speaks to men for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation, he has in mind an ethical function. One of the clearest indications that Paul considers ethics among the primary responsibilities of the prophet is that edification is the specified characteristic which love and prophecy have in common. As Wendland says, "Daher geschieht durch die Prophetie die Erbauung der Gemeinde."[1]

Up to this point we have considered οἰκοδομέω as it denotes the process of building, but it must be noted that Paul also uses it as a metaphor for the church itself. In I Cor. 3:9 the Apostle says: "You are God's field, God's building." Bonnard says that when Paul writes θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε, "c'est l'esemble des membres de l'Eglise de Corinthe."[2] J. A. T. Robinson contends that whenever Paul uses οἰκοδομή it means the Body of Christ, the Church. Best denies this view and says that Robinson's assertion "is statistically inadequate; it has this meaning only twice (I Cor. 3:9; Eph. 2:21); elsewhere it refers to the process of building up the Church and not what is built (Eph. 4:12, 16; I Cor.

---

[1]Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, "Die Briefe an die Korinther," Das Neue Testament Deutsch (Göttingen: Bandenhoech & Ruprecht), II (1938), 369.

[2]Pierre Bonnard, Jesus-Christ Édifiant son Église (Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, S. A., 1948), p. 37.

14:12)."[1] The position of Best is more tenable. In this passage Paul, without doubt, refers to the congregation as a building, however, even here the thrust of the passage centers on the activity, or process of building. Minear writes: "If we are invited to visualize something here, it is not the entire structure in which each part has a separate allegorical equivalent. . . . Rather, attention is concentrated on the process of construction. . . . In other words, the image directs our minds to the continuing dramatic action on the part of both God and man, rather than to the contour of the completed house."[2]

Although Paul is reticent to present the church as a completed edifice, it is the edification of the church which he emphasizes. I Cor. 14, alone, makes this clear. In 14:4 we read: "He who speaks in a tongue edifies himself, but he who prophesies edifies the church." In the next verse: "He who prophesies is greater than he who speaks in tongues, unless some interprets, so that the church may be edified." This idea is also supported by the context. In chapter 12 PAul uses the metaphorsof the Body of Christ as he pleads for the unity of the church. Best points out that the combination of these metaphor is not unnatural. He writes:

---

[1]Ernest Best, One Body in Christ (London: S. P. C. K., 1955), p. 161.

[2]Paul Minear, Images of the Church in the New Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), pp. 49-50.

"Occasionally in Jewish literature the body is regarded as a 'house.' 'Building,' 'palace,' and 'house' are frequent expressions for the body in Gnosticism; the body is the house of the soul. Paul uses οἰκοδομή of the resurrection body, and οἰκία of our present condition (II Cor. 5:1)."[1] The church is the primary concern of Paul in both chapters, in 12 its unity, in 14 its edification. Here, as Cullmann writes: ". . . he has preserved everything which can contribute to the 'building up' of the body of Christ."[2]

In 14:6 Paul raises a question with an obvious answer. If he should visit the Corinthians what good would it do them if he speaks to them in an ecstatic language which they cannot understand? Obviously, to benefit them he must speak so that they can understand. He gives four examples of speaking to them: ἢ ἐν ἀποκαλύχει ἢ ἐν γνώσει ἢ ἐν προφητείᾳ ἢ ἐν διδαχῇ (in revelation or in knowledge or in prophecy or in teaching). Most scholars put these in pairs so that prophesying is understood as expressing the things which are revealed, and teaching is understood as expressing the knowledge which is at hand.[3] What is the revelation which the

---

[1]Best, op. cit., p. 161; cf. I Cor. 6:18 where the body is a temple of the Holy Spirit; Eph. 4:12, 16 where 'building up' is applied to the body.

[2]Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, trans. A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (London: S. C. M. Press, 1953), p. 26.

[3]Cf. Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., 308; Findlay, op. cit., p. 90; F. W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians of New International Commentary

prophet utters? Calvin rightly points out that, in this text, revelation is not to be understood in the futuristic eschatological sense. Prophets are, he says, "men endowed with extraordinary wisdom and aptitude for grasping what the immediate need of the Church is, and speaking the right word to meet it. That is why they are, so to speak, messengers who bring news of what God wants."[1] Calvin emphasizes the idea that the prophet makes "known the will of God, by applying prophecies, threats, promises and all the teaching of Scripture to the current needs of the Church."[2] Wendland agrees with Calvin regarding 'revelation' in this text. He says: ". . . wir unter 'Offenbarung' an eine bestimmte, einzelne, eine Frage oder Not der Gemeinde erhellende Offenbarung zu denken haben."[3] If this interpretation is correct it agrees with our thesis that Paul conceived of the task of the prophet as embracing the ethical function.

Paul also illustrates his point that prophecy is superior to glossolalia with the example of lifeless musical instruments. If the notes of the flute and harp are not

---

on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1960), pp. 320-321; John Calvin, The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, trans. John W. Fraser, ed. David W. and Thomas F. Torrance, Vol. IX of Calvin's Commentaries (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1960), p. 288.

[1]Ibid., p. 271. [2]Ibid., p. 271; cf. p. 288.

[3]Wendland, op. cit., p. 83.

διαστολὴν (distinct), how will anyone know what is fluted or what is harped? And if the bugle gives ἄδηλον (inconspicuous or indistinct) sounds, who will make preparations for battle? It is the same with the Corinthians, if they do not give εὔσημον λόγον (intelligible speech) how will their speaking be known? The basic meaning of εὔσημος is "easily recognizable, clear, distinct."[1] Plummer includes 'well-marked,' 'definite,' 'significant.'[2] The point common to all three examples is that what is heard must be distinct in order to be useful, to accomplish its purpose. Paul seems to be piling up words to get across the idea that the crucial element in the hearing medium is not the loudness or softness, but that whatever is sounded by musical instruments or human voice must be distinct, conspicuous, clear, easily recognizable if it is to achieve effective communication. To drive his point further he says, in effect, that any language which is not understood is a foreign language. Paul closes his argument with an exhortation for a proper attitude of the congregation in its meetings. The Corinthians are eager for spiritual gifts; Paul urges them to strive to make the gifts serve to edify the congregation. As we have seen edification, for Paul, has ethical connotations. In this context Paul's examples of the uselessness of speech which carries no clear, distinct

---

[1] Bauer, Ardnt, Gingrich, op. cit., p. 326.

[2] Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 329.

meaning and his exhortation for edification indicate a plea for words which give definite ethical direction. As the sound of a bugle must be distinctive if it is to bring about the action of preparation, so must the words of the tongue be clear and definite if they are to be effective in guiding modes of conduct. It was, as far as Paul was concerned, this particular quality of prophecy which made it superior to glossalalia.

Having established that the criterion for conduct is the edification of the church, Paul pleads for the use of the νούς (mind). No doubt, Paul wants to correct a Greek notion current among the Corinthians which attributed the inspiration of prophecy to 'madness,' i.e. an inspired prophet has no control over his mind. In Plato's Phaedrus, for example, Socrates refers to prophecy as madness and says that the good accomplished by the oracles at Delphi and Dodonna occurred only when the prophets were out of their senses. For him, the truly inspired man is "truly possessed and duly out of his mind."[1] In Timaeus Plato argues: ". . . no man achieves true and inspired divination when in his rational mind, but only when the power of his intelligence is fettered in sleep or when it is distraught by disease or by reason of some divine inspiration."[2]

---

[1]Plato, The Dialogues of Plato, Vol. I, trans. B. Jowett (New York: Random House, 1937), p. 249.

[2]Plato, Timaeus, trans. R. G. Bury, Vol. VII of Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929), p. 71.

In the writings of Philo, a contemporary of Paul's, we find the same idea regarding the mental state of the inspired prophet. He writes:

> For no pronouncement of a prophet is ever his own; he is an interpreter prompted by Another in all his utterances, when knowing not what he does he is filled with inspiration, as the reason withdraws and surrenders the citadel of the soul to a new visitor and tenant, the Divine Spirit which plays upon the vocal organism, and dictates words which clearly expresses its prophetic message.[1]

In other passages Philo indicates that a prophet, when inspired, enters into an ecstatic state and his mental powers cease. In Who is the Heir? we read:

> So while the radiance of the mind is still all around us, when it pours as if it were a noonday beam into the whole soul, we are self contained, not possessed. But when it comes to its setting, naturally ecstasy and divine possession and madness fall upon us. . . . The mind is evicted at the arrival of the divine Spirit, but when that departs the mind returns to its tenancy.[2]

Paul wants to overcome the idea that the truly inspired prophet was one whose human reasoning faculties had been completely overwhelmed by an invading deity. He stresses the use of the mind. Dentan points out that, in the New Testament, the word νοῦς occurs almost exclusively in the Pauline and Pastoral letters. Paul uses it four times in I Cor. 14-19.[3]

---

[1]Philo, The Special Laws, iv.49.

[2]Philo, Who is the Heir? p. 53.

[3]R. C. Dentan, "Mind," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George Buttrick III (1962), p. 383.

In this same discussion the Apostle uses φρέσιν, a synonym for νούς, twice.[1] Obviously, he wants to emphasize the necessity for mature thinking and judgment among the Corinthians so that the congregation might be edified.

In verses 14-16 Paul states that, when he prays, sings, blesses with the Spirit, it does not mean that his mind is not present. He says: "I will pray with the Spirit and I will pray with the mind; I will sing with the Spirit and with the mind." Otherwise, if the mind does not function, if one gives thanks just with the Spirit and speaks in a tongue, those who are present without the gift cannot say "Amen," so be it, which is the usual response to thanksgiving. In verse 17 Paul states his judgment, "For you may give thanks well enough, but the other man is not edified." As we saw, this means, for Paul, that it is worthless. In verses 18-19 he damns speaking in tongues with faint praise, "I thank God that I speak with tongues more than you all; nevertheless, in church I would rather speak five words with my mind in

---

[1] Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), pp. 211-220 for a thorough treatment of the meaning of νούς in Paul's writings. He points out that by νούς is meant not the mind or the intellect as a special faculty, not a higher principle in man, "but the knowing, understanding, and judging which belong to man as man and determine what attitude he adopts," (p. 211). Also νούς should not be understood as a contemplative attitude but it includes "the taking of a stand, a conscious or unconscious volition; it is an understanding intention . . . a knowing and understanding . . . that contains an aim toward action" (pp. 211-212).

order to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue." The congregation cannot be benefited by the working of the Spirit which eliminates reason. For Paul, edification of the congregation is crucial.

Since it is the prophet who edifies, it is the prophet, in contrast to the speaker in tongues, whose mind, not just the Spirit, is at work in his speaking. Friedrich says: "Der Prophet in den paulinischen Gemeinden ist nicht Seher sondern Wortempfänger und Wortverkündiger. Er is nicht ein von der Göttheit Besessener, der, seiner Sinne nicht mächtig, tun muss, was die in ihm wohnende Macht befiehlt. Geistesabwesenheit oder Raserei sind ihm fremd. Der urchristliche Prophet ist ein Mann mit klarem Bewusstsein."[1]

That a prophet is in control of his rational faculties is shown in Paul's instructions in verses 29-30. When a prophet is speaking, he can immediately break off as soon as a revelation is received by another sitting nearby. Two or three prophets are to speak at the meeting, while the others are to remain silent and weigh what is said even though some of them may have a revelation. A prophet cannot control a revelation but he can determine the proper time for announcing it. He is obliged to use his reasoning faculties. The coming of a revelation or the inspiration of the Spirit does not cause a prophet to become a helpless tool, "sondern das

---

[1] D. Gerhard Friedrich, "προφήτης," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel (2nd. ed. rev. ed. G. Friedrich; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag), VI (1959), p. 852.

verantwortliche Personsein des Propheten bleibt erhalten, wenn auch der ganze Mensch mit seinem Verstand und Willen unter der Wirksamkeit des Geistes steht."[1]

As Friedrich points out, this insight should be used in trying to understand Paul's statement in Rom. 12:6, "Let us prophesy in proportion to our faith" (κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν). The whole of Romans 12 is similar, in content, to I Cor. 12-14. The Romans passage also deals with the correct use of spiritual gifts. They are spoken of in terms of responsibility rather than pride. Paul speaks against enthusiastic pneumatics who do not remain on the sober ground of belief. He reminds them that it is God who measures out the faith (12:3); he assigns the gifts (12:6). "Wenn Paulus von der Analogie des Glaubens redet, so meint er mit πίστις die gelebte χάρις. Gott schenkt, und der Mensch muss von dem Geschenk verantwortlich Gebrauch machen."[2] The prophet should not extend his talk beyond the consciousness of inspiration which God has given him. He has a responsibility to speak within the bounds of faith; he must retain sober judgment and not be carried away by the Spirit to the point of forgetting, or losing sight of, his duty to edify the church. As Bornkamm says, "Prophecy is for him [Paul] essentially rational speech (λαλεῖν ἐν νοΐ) in contrast to that pneumatic ecstasy (λαλεῖν ἐν πνεύματι).[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 853. [2] Ibid.

[3] G. Bornkamm, "Faith and Reason in Paul's Epistles," New Testament Studies, IV (1957-58), p. 98.

It must be stressed that Paul's plea for reason is not a disparagement of the Spirit. His fight is against the Corinthian misunderstanding of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. There is no opposition between mind and Spirit. In I Cor. 2:14-16 Paul says that the spiritual man has the mind of Christ. Paul's plea for the use of the mind belongs to the greater cause of edification, which, in turn, belongs to the realm of ethics as does the Spirit.

The close relationship between mind and ethics in Paul's thought is also seen in II Cor. 5:13-14 where we read: "For if we are beside ourselves, it is for God; if we are in our right mind (σωφρονοῦμεν), it is for you. For the love of Christ controls us." These words which connect being in the right mind with ethical action are found in the midst of Paul's defense that he does not take advantage of being ecstatic which is reminiscent of his discussion in I Cor. 14. The ethical aspect is clear on two points. In the first place he states that if he is in his right mind it is for other people, i.e., the Corinthians. In the second place his right thinking for others is the result of the fact that it is the love of Christ which controls him. We have already discussed the idea that Paul's ethical thinking is based on and takes its shape from the self-giving love of Christ.

It must also be noted that this defense follows one of Paul's clearest statements regarding reward and punishment

in the future life for one's actions in the present life. He writes: "For it is necessary for us all to appear before the judgment seat of Christ in order that each may receive a recompense (κομίσηται), for the things which he has done (πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν), through the body" (v.10). The use of πράσσω (act, do) is significant, because, as Plummer[1] and Filson[2] point out, Paul obviously means that habitual moral action, rather than mere performance and production (ποιειν) is decisive in the judgment. In II Cor. 12:21; I Cor. 5:2; Rom. 2:1, 2; 7:15, 18; 13:4 Paul uses πράσσω in designating morally evil action, in I Cor. 9:17 and Phil. 4:9 it is used for what is morally good. Paul's use of πράσσωin II Cor. 5:13-14 points up the association in Pauline thought between right thinking and ethical action.

Moe's study shows the ethical implications of Paul's use of the νούς.[3] He points out that in Rom. 7:23, where Paul speaks of the war between the 'law of my mind' and the 'law of sin,' the νούς means ethical consciousness; it approaches the broader definition of ethical attitude.[4] Paul says that he serves the law of God with his mind, and

---

[1]Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 158.

[2]Floyd V. Filson, St. Paul's Conception of Recompense (Leipzig: J. D. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1931), p. 108.

[3]Olaf Moe, "Vernunft und Geist im Neuen Testament," Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie, XI (1933-34), pp. 351-390.

[4]Ibid., p. 360.

with the flesh he serves the law of sin. Clearly the νούς of these verses belongs to a man under obligation to walk the way of those who have accepted the way of God in Christ, the way of love.

The same idea occurs in Rom. 12:2:[1] "be transformed by the renewal of your mind" (μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοός). "Paulus fordert hier, . . . eine sittliche Verwandlung, die durch Erneuerung des ganzen moralischen Bewusstseins der Leser herbeigeführt wird."[2] It is significant that this demand for renewal of the mind stands as the introduction to the exhortation section of the entire letter. The remainder of this sentence which states the reason for the renewal of the mind, makes it clear that the renewal must lead to ethical action. Renew your mind εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν (that you may examine or approve, what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect. He follows this admonishment with a discussion of the proper attitude toward spiritual gifts. The remainder of the chapter is an exhortation introduced by, "Let love be genuine, hate what is evil, hold fast to what is good; love one another with brotherly affection." (v. 9)

---

[1]Cf. Horace E. Stoessel, "Notes on Romans 12:1-2," Interpretation, XVII (1963), 161-175.

[2]Moe, op. cit., p. 360.

In Col. 1:9-10 Paul prays that the Colossians "may be filled with knowledge of his (God's) will in all spiritual wisdom and understanding to lead a life worthy of the Lord, fully pleasing to him, bearing fruit in every good work. . . . " In Phil. 1:9-10 he prays "that your love may abound more and more, with knowledge and all discernment so that you may approve [εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς] what is excellent, and may be pure, and blameless for the day of Christ." All these texts indicate that the renewal of the mind and the knowledge of the will of God are, for Paul, the beginning of ethical action (cf. Rom. 6).

In I Cor. 14:20-25 Paul continues his admonition for mature thinking with the illustration of the different effects which prophecy and glossolalia have on non-believers. He urges his readers not to be children in regard to thinking but to be mature (ταῖς φρεσίν ἀλλὰ . . . ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶν τέλειοι γίνεσθε). This is the only occurence of φρηόν (mind) in the New Testament. It does not have exactly the same meaning as νούς. "φρήν means rather a quality which has its seat in the νούς."[1] It means thinking or understanding with the connotation of judgment or "reasoning power on its reflective and discriminating side."[2] The Corinthians are acting like children when they prefer glossolalia to that which is truly

---

[1]Héring, op. cit., p. 151.

[2]Findlay, op. cit., p. 909.

valuable. They should develop their reasoning ability and recognize that prophecy, unlike speaking in tongues, has value for the church.

Paul uses a text in Isaiah (28:11, 12), which he quotes freely,[1] to show that "tongues are a sign not for believers but for unbelievers, while prophecy is not for unbelievers but for believers" (v. 22). In Isaiah the speaking in foreign tongues is a sign of judgment against Judah that her people have sinned against God. Moffatt says: "The sign was intended to confirm skepticism, instead of arousing or inspiring faith as prophecy did."[2] The Jews who refused to listen to the prophet Isaiah were condemned to listen to the gibberish of their enemy, the Assyrians.[3] Paul gives the text a new direction of concern. In Isaiah being spoken to in foreign or alien tongues is a sign to the people of God of their sin, of their unbelief. They have heard the word of God and rejected it. So then, ὥστε v. 22), just as in Isaiah, glossolalia serves as a sign to men who do not believe. Paul, however, indicates that he does not understand glossolalia as a sign of judgment on the church; for him it is not a sign of

---

[1]Cf. J. P. M. Sweet, "A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia," New Testament Studies, XIII (1967), 240-257 for a thorough discussion of various interpretations of this passage.

[2]Moffatt, op. cit., p. 223.

[3]Cf. Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., pp. 316-317.

unbelief on the part of the community. Paul is primarily concerned, in this context, for those outside the community and the effect which speaking in tongues will have on them. It is obvious that Paul wanted the outsider and unbeliever to be attracted to faith and the Christian community. He contends that glossolalia will repel the outsiders; it will be a sign to them that those who speak in tongues are crazy. In v.23 Paul raises a practical question: "If the whole church assembles and all speak in tongues, and outsiders or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are mad?" In other words, outsiders or unbelievers will turn away, they will be confirmed in their unbelief. Πάντες (all) most likely does not mean that all spoke at one time since it cannot have that meaning in v. 24. Probably πάντες means all the people speaking in tongues took turns in speaking. No one could understand and called the ones speaking insane. According to Bauer-Ardnt-Gingrich the ἰδιῶται (outsider) and ἄπιστοι (unbeliever) stand together as a contrast to the Christian congregation. "The ἰδιῶται are neither similar to the ἄπιστοι nor are they full-fledged Christians; obviously they stand between the two groups as a kind of proselytes or catechumens."[1] I Cor. 14:16 indicates that the ἰδιῶται had a special place in the room where the Christians assembled which would mean they had a closer relationship with the Christian group than the

---

[1]Bauer, Ardnt, Gingrich, op. cit., p. 371.

ἄπιστοι. In any event both groups would think the Corinthian congregation crazy if they spoke in tongues.

Prophecy, on the other hand, has an entirely different effect on the ἰδιῶται and ἄπιστοι. It has the effect of conversion. The outsider or the unbeliever is convicted by all (ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων) the prophets who arouse his conscience so that he is overwhelmed by his sense of sin. Also, he is called to account by all (ἀνακρίνεται ὑπὸ πάντων), or as Plummer says, "he is put upon his trial and the details of his condition are investigated."[1] The secrets of his heart become manifest. The unbeliever recognizes his own condition as one of sin and dependence on God. "The scrutiny in the court of conscience (ἀνάκρισις) produces self-revelation, self-condemnation and submission."[2] He becomes overwhelmed; spontaneously he expresses submission and gratitude: "and so, falling on his face, he will worship God and declare that God is really among you" (v. 25). "Der Prophezeiende lässt den göttlichen Gerichts- und Bussruf erschallen . . . der aber andere ihrer Schuld überführt und sie zur Anbetung Gottes bringt."[3]

It should be noted that this is an instance which indicates that the words of the prophets were not limited to

---

[1]Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 318.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Friedrich, op. cit., p. 830.

ethical injunctions. Apparently it is the pronouncement by the prophet of a man's deepest thought which convicts him of sin.[1] As Bornkamn says, "ἐλέγχεσθαι does not primarily refer to a theoretical conviction of the correctness of a doctrine, but rather that the man who hears the Word finds that it discloses the real nature of his own being and makes the secrets of his heart manifest."[2] Some scholars understand this as mind reading on the part of the prophets.[3] More likely the Christian prophets, inspired by the Holy Spirit and sensitive to the nature of man, spoke in such a way that his listeners unconsciously responded: "This is for me."[4] Sweet says: "Here surely it is much more what is described in Heb. iv. 12-13: the word of God, spoken by the prophets, sifts the purposes and thoughts of the heart, and cuts away the veils men put between themselves and God."[5] The believer discovers the secrets of his own heart which had been hidden and becomes aware of the judgment of God.

---

[1]Cf. John 16:8ff. where the Holy Spirit "will convince the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment."

[2]Bornkamn, op. cit., p. 99.

[3]Héring, op. cit., p. 152; H. L. Goudge, First Epistle to the Corinthians (London: Methuen & Co., 1903), pp. 129-130.

[4]E. B. Allo, Premierè Épitre Aux Corinthiens (Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1935), p. 367; Groshiede, op. cit., p. 333; Moffatt, op. cit., p. 224.

[5]Sweet, op. cit., p. 245.

The picture of the sinner painted by the prophet which convicts the listeners would involve more than moral laxity; it would involve one's whole relationship with God. In other words, the prophetic word is not exclusively ethical. The greater, or more inclusive, concern of the prophet, both in the Old and New Testaments, was man's relationship with God. The point of this passage is that when a prophet truly prophesies, and his word is understood, the will of God is made clear and those who hear--outsider, believer, or unbeliever--become keenly aware of their sin, of the presence of God, and of their absolute dependence upon God. Moffatt writes: "With the power of spiritual discernment vouchsafed to intelligence and some experience of life, these men who exercise their gift with no thought except that of extolling God's power and love and moving others to share in his benefits, produce this extraordinary effect."[1]

In v. 26 Paul begins an explanation of what all this means in regard to the worship service. He repeats the principle: "let all things happen for edification (πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γινεσθω)," and then gives practical directions for applying it. If there are those who speak in tongues let two or three speak provided there are interpreters. If there are no interpreters the speakers in tongues should keep silent during the worship (vv. 27-28).

---

[1]Moffatt, op. cit., p. 225.

Paul also limits the number of prophets who speak to two or three, and let the others judge (καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέτωσαν. Does ἄλλοι refer to other members of the congregation or other prophets? This belongs to a larger question: 'Did Paul consider every Christian a prophet or was there a particular limited circle of prophets?' Greeven has studied this question extensively. After considering each text in Corinthians which pertains to the problem he concludes:

> Aufs Ganze gesehen bietet also der I Korintherbrief kein einheitliches Bild. Neben Umrissen, in denen sich ein fest abgegrenzter Stand der Propheten abzuzeichnen beginnt, ist das Bewusstsein vom allgemeinen Prophetentum aller Gläubigen deutlich erkennbar. Mit anderen Worten: wir tun einen Blick in einen Prozess, an dessen Abschluss das Charisma der Prophetie beschränkt erscheint auf einzelne, dadurch herausgehobene Gemeindeglieder. Aber dieser Abschluss ist noch nicht erreicht; die Anfänge, in denen die Prophetie ein Besitz der ganzen Gemeinde war, scheinen noch durch.[1]

Most scholars agree with Greeven on this point. Wotherspoon says that there was no official cast or order of prophets. All had the possibility, but probably, with the passage of time, there were some who prophesied more frequently and more effectively. No doubt, these men came to be referred to as 'a prophet.'[2] Beker says, ". . . every Christian is poten-

---

[1] D. H. Greeven, "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIV (1952), 8.

[2] H. J. Wotherspoon, The Ministry in the Church (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1916), pp. 140-141.

tially a prophet."[1] However, Rom. 12:3-6 and I Cor. 12 show that, in the concrete historical situation, all did not become prophets. Different members of the congregation performed different functions; some came to be recognized as prophets while some came to be recognized as teachers, etc.[2]

It must be agreed that there were certain men in the congregations who were known as prophets. However, this does not necessarily mean that ἄλλοι refers to other prophets. More likely, it refers to all the Christians listening. All had the responsibility to judge critically the words of the prophet who was speaking. I Thes. 5:11-21, which we have discussed, supports this idea. Verses 19-20, in particular, speak of the responsibility of the entire congregation to test (δοκιμάζετε) everything which has been prophesied. It should also be noted that verse 11 clearly urges all members of the Thessalonian community to encourage and edify one another (cf. I Cor. 3:10-15). "Even if the prophetic utterance is correct, inspired by the Spirit of God, the congregation has the duty to 'discern' what must be done with such an utterance, namely whether it is of value for the church."[3]

---

[1]Johan C. Beker, "Prophecy and the Spirit in the Apostolic Fathers," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1955, p. 12.

[2]Ibid., p. 16; cf. von Campenhausen, op. cit., pp. 66-68.

[3]Groshiede, op. cit., p. 338.

Our discussion regarding the mind is relevant at this point. The congregation is admonished to be mature in their thinking. It must be stressed that Paul is speaking to Christians, to those whose bodies are the temples of the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 6:19). This means, as Best observes, that "the Holy Spirit dwells in his (the Christian's) whole being or personality."[1] In other words when Paul admonishes his congregations to be mature in thinking he is speaking to people whose minds are directed toward and controlled by the Spirit and for whom the 'walk according to the Spirit' is the ethical norm. The Christian, however, is not an automaton. He must constantly use his mind in making ethical decisions. In Rom. 12:2 Paul states that the mind must be renewed. This passage shows that the critical function of the mind is not restricted but is enabled to recognize, by testing, the will of God.[2] Schrage sees the ethical implication of this. He says that εἰς τὸ δοκιμάξειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ (that you might test or examine the will of God) points toward the duty of the Christian to ask, 'what is the will of God in the particular situation?' He writes:

> Diese Weisheit der Wahl fur den Augenblick folgt eben aus dem erneuerten sittlichen Urteils-und Erkenntnisvermögen, das den Christen im jeweiligen Augenblick das richtige sittliche Urteil fällen lässt. Sicherlich ist

---

[1] Best, op. cit., p. 75.

[2] Werner Schmauck, "Das prophetische Amt in der Gemeinde," Junge Kirche, XIX (1958), pp. 128-129.

> in diesen Aufruf zur Erkenntnis und Prüfung des göttlichen Willens auch die Möglichkeit mit eingeschlossen, in der konkreten Situation das überlieferte Worte recht anwenden au können, weil eben auch dies zum δοκιμάξειν hinzugehört.[1]

Paul attributes to the discerning (judging) activity of intelligence the high task of setting ethical goals for man, to seek out here and now the will of God.

A similar interpretation can be given to Phil. 4:8f. In this passage Paul ends his exhortation with a short catalog of things pleasing to God and says "think about these things (ταῦτα λογίξεσθε)." Schrage points out that λογίξέσθε is best translated with 'consider,' 'ponder,' because, for Paul, it means the act of judging which is based on knowledge and perception of the ethical norm.[2] It is significant that Paul places, after this command to ponder these things, the exhortation to act, to do (v. 9). Thinking about those things which please God leads to ethical action.

Examination and pondering are also demanded in I Thes. 5:21. Immediately after Paul urges his readers not to despise prophesying he says: "test everything, hold fast what is good, (πάντὰ δὲ δοκιμάξετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε). As we noted earlier, this command occurs in the midst of the exhortation section of the letter. The same idea occurs in

---

[1] Schrage, op. cit., p. 169.

[2] Ibid., p. 170.

Phil. 1:9-10 where what is excellent must be discerned, approved, tested.

For Paul, as we saw, the law of the Christian life is the law of love. However, these texts indicate that the correct action for a particular situation must be discerned in concrete terms. Schrage says:

> Materialiter ist das, worauf es unter allen Umständen ankommt, wohl vor allem die Liebe, aber zunächst ist weniger das Gebot der Liebe als ganz formal das Gebot der Stunde gemeint: Das, worauf es ankommt, ist das, worauf es in der jeweiligen Situation ankommt, was im einzelnen Fall der Wille Gottes ist. Dieses Fragen der erneuerten Vernunft nach dem im hic et nunc konkret Gebotenen ist seiner Natur nach stets neu zu vollziehen. Wenn auch die Glaubenden durch Belehrung und Erfahrung vieles durchaus 'wissen' können, so ist dieses Wissen doch kein abgeschlossenes, das weiteres Prüfen und Urteilen überflüssig machte.[1]

The more and more (μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον) of love, knowledge, and discernment for which Paul prays in Phil. 1:9 makes it clear that they experience a growth and maturing. There is no definite end or being finished; "das vielfaltige Leben stellt immer neue Aufgaben, so dass es immer wiede neu zur Pflicht wird, mit dem an den Geboten geschulten Blick der Liebe zu erfassen, was im Augenblick Gottes wille ist."[2]

Again the proper relationship between νοῦς and πνεῦμα and their relationship to Paul's ethics must be kept in mind. This emphasis on the mind and thinking seems to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 172. [2] Ibid.

contradict what has been said about the Spirit as the "norm of the Christian life." It must be remembered that Paul does not set mind and spirit in opposition to one another, nor do they exclude each other. On the contrary, according to I Cor. 2:14-16 the spiritual man has the mind of Christ. All of Paul's admonitions to use the mind are made to those whose lives have been invaded by the Spirit, to the Christians (II Cor. 1:22; Rom. 8:15-16). Paul appeals to the new being, the new creation, and, as Moe points out, the νους belongs to this rebirth.[1] When Paul urges the use of the mind he refers to the mind of the one who is in Christ, in the Spirit. He says: "For those who live according to the Spirit set their mind on things of the Spirit" (Rom. 8:5). Schrage observes: "Die Begründung allen sittliche Handelns bei Paulus ist gewiss keine rationale, sondern eine pneumatisch-sakramentale, aber das schliesst den Gebrauch der ratio in der Erkenntnis des Guten für den Christen nicht aus."[2]

Apparently the Corinthians shared the Greek view that the coming of the Spirit meant the dismissal of the mind. Paul seeks to correct this idea and urges the use of the mind and mature thinking. The presence of the Spirit in man does not eliminate reason but simply gives it a new direction. Moe writes: "Der Geist und die Vernunft sollen nicht bloss nebeneinander, sondern ineinander wirken. Die Vernunft soll

---

[1] Moe, op. cit., p. 361.

[2] Schrage, op. cit., p. 165.

durch den heiligen Geist zu einer geistlichen Vernunft, einem Nus pneumatikos umgebildet werden."[1]

For Paul it is the particular responsibility of the prophet to use his mind and speak in an intelligible and understandable way to the congregation about matters of ethics. In I Cor. 14:29 Paul lays this prophetic responsibility on all members of the congregation. The prophets speak and the others judge critically what he says in terms of the law of love and their own particular situation. ". . . der Prophet ergreift zu ganz konkreten Fragen der Gegenwart das Wort. Er sagt nicht nur, was Gott zu tun beabsichtigt, sondern er verkündigt auch, was Gott von den Menchen getan haben will."[2]

As we saw v. 30 indicates that the inspired prophets did not lose control of themselves. They were able to stop speaking when a revelation came to another. Paul urges this order so that all who had a revelation could prophesy one by one, and all could hear and thereby learn and be exhorted. Paul's statement, "and the spirits of prophets are subject to prophets" (καὶ πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται) presents a question as to whether he means that prophets are subject to other prophets or the spirit of the prophet is controlled by the prophet who speaks. Robertson and Plummer

---

[1]Moe, op. cit., p. 387.

[2]Friedrich, op. cit., p. 850.

point out that the juxtaposition of προφητῶν and προφήταις speaks against the former interpretation.[1] Discussing the 'revelations' which come to the prophets Allo says: ". . . le prophete restait libre de les communiquer ou de les garder pour lui; car ses 'esprits,' ses inspirations, lui étaient soumis, non dans leur source, mais au point de vue de l'usage qu'il en faisait,"[2] The context also speaks for this interpretation. Paul wants to correct the Corinthian view of the prophet. For him, in contrast to the Greek view, the true prophet, although inspired, is in control of his speech. It must be noted that Paul is here referring to order, to the beginning and ending of speech. The prophet himself exercises this control. However, what the prophet says is subject to the scrutiny of the entire congregation. It is the responsibility of the listeners to test and weigh the content of the prophetic utterance. Paul concludes this point with an incontrovertible idea: the God who inspires the prophets is not a God of disorder but of peace.

In his concluding remarks about prophecy, Paul clearly states that what he is writing is a decisive criterion for judging whether or not a man is a prophet or any spiritual. Most scholars are agreed that by 'spiritual' Paul means anyone who is inspired.[3] Moe gives the term a richer meaning.

---

[1]Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 323.

[2]Allo, op. cit., p. 371.

[3]Héring, op. cit., p. 155; Moffatt, op. cit., p. 231; Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 327; Findlay, op. cit., p. 916.

He writes: ". . . gebraucht Paulus das Wort πνευματικός, um den Stand desjenigen Christen zu bezeichnen, dessen Persönlichkeit, Verstand, und Wille vom Geiste durchdrungen sind. Im Geiste, ἐν πνεύματι, zu sein, heisst nicht im Zustande der Ekstase oder des Enthusiasmus sich befinden, sondern den Geist und nicht das Fleisch zum Bestimmungsgrund seines persönlichen Lebens zu haben."[1] Convinced that he has the Spirit (I Cor. 7:40), Paul writes: "If any one thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that what I am writing to you is a command of the Lord" (v. 37). Anyone who claims to be a prophet or spiritual can prove his position by recognizing that what Paul writes comes from the Lord. If he (Paul) has the Spirit then he believes that his words will stand up under the careful scrutiny of a true spiritual whose mind is set on the Spirit. In another passage of this letter the Apostle, appealing to the intelligence of the Corinthians, urges them to subject what he is saying to their judgment (10:15). If anyone fails to see that the words of Paul are the Word of God, it is conclusive proof that this man is no prophet, that he has no spiritual gift. In other words, the true prophetic word is to be found in Paul's writings. As we saw in chapter 4 Paul presented himself as a prophet, and his writings show that he interpreted the law of love to meet specific problems which arose. I Corinthians itself is an excellent example of such interpretation.

---

[1] Moe, op. cit., p. 389.

From this study of chapter 14 we see that, for Paul, the prophet had a definite ethical responsibility. The Apostle's use of οἰκοδομήν in referring to the effect of love and prophecy makes it clear that he conceived of the prophet as somehow definitely related to the work of love which is the ethical norm of the Christian life. This idea is strengthened by Paul's designation of παράκλησις and παραμυθίαν, which belong to his ethical vocabulary, to the purpose of the one who prophesies. The association made between the mind and prophecy also reveals Paul's conception of the prophetic role as one which includes discerning the will of God for man in concrete situations. Schmauch asserts: "Christliche Prophetie ist darum stets ein aktuelles Konkretissimum."[1] Perhaps this is an overstatement, but there can be no doubt that Paul definitely saw the ethical function as a primary one for the prophet. This substantiates our thesis which holds that the original position of chapter 13 was just prior to chapter 14. In chapter 13 Paul presents the law of the Christian life; in 14 he presents the Christian prophet as its interpreter for particular situations. The place of Christian prophecy, for Paul, is the Christian community gathered for worship. The congregation meets and listens to its prophets, who, guided by the Spirit, speak regarding an ethical action based on the law of love and the particular

---

[1] Schmauch, op. cit., p. 130.

situation which confronts them.[1] The community, guided by the Spirit, assumes its prophetic responsibility in criticizing and acting upon the words of the prophet.

Paul's final exhortation regarding the worship service serves as a summary for the entire chapter: "my brethren, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues; but all things should be done decently and in order (vv. 39-40).

---

[1]Cf. Oscar Cullman, Le Culte dans l'Église Primitive (Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, S. A., 1944), p. 25; George T. Montague, Growth in Christ (Kirkwood, Mo.: Maryhurst Press, 1960), pp. 242-243; Hugh M. Scott, "Place of οικοδομεω in New Testament Worship," Princeton Theological Review, II (1904), 402-424, who assert that edification takes place in the common worship service.

CONCLUSION

The concept of prophecy in the writings of Paul has received little attention from New Testament scholars. This is surprising both because of the significant role which prophecy played in the Old Testament, the Intertestamental Literature, and the New Testament and because of the centrality of Paul as a figure in early Christianity. Although Paul uses the term προφήτης and its cognates few times and deals with the concept extensively only once in his writings, other concepts which are closely associated with prophecy, e.g., the Holy Spirit, are crucial in his thought. Also Paul was steeped in the Old Testament and rabbinic thought. For these reasons we have sought to determine Paul's understanding of prophecy in this study.

Scholars have recognized the importance of prophecy in the Apostle's thinking, noting that he placed prophets second only to apostles when discussing the gifts of the Spirit as well as his preference for prophecy over glossalalia. Paul's understanding of prophets has been discussed in connection with church order and the problem of the decline of charismatic offices and the rise of the institutional church. However, questions remained. What, precisely, is the function of prophecy? What is the particular work of the prophet? When

Paul said, "he who prophesies speaks to men for their upbuilding encouragement and consolation" (I Cor. 14:3), what did he mean? What did he want the Corinthians to do when he urged them, "So, my brethren, earnestly desire to prophesy. . . ." (I Cor. 14:39)?

To arrive at an answer to these questions the concept of prophecy in the background of Pauline thought, i.e., the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature has been considered. It was found, on the one hand, that the belief that prophecy had ceased was prevalent in Jewish thinking prior to the time of Jesus. On the other hand, there existed a fervent hope for its return as well as for a prophet who would come in the eschatological age. No attempt was made to determine the identity of the expected prophet; our primary concern was to ascertain the role he was expected to play in the messianic age. Jewish thinking was not homogeneous on this matter. Ideas regarding the task of the eschatological prophet varied. However, the concept of the prophet as lawgiver or interpreter of the law was one of the major forms of belief in regard to his function. The Old Testament, Rabbinic Literature, Apocrypha, Samaritan writings, and Dead Sea Scrolls reflect the expectation of a prophet who would come in the new age and make final, definitive decisions about the law. As interpreter of the law, the prophet would perform the ethical function of indicating the direction of action for God's people.

A study of Paul's concept of the Holy Spirit and its eschatological significance revealed that, for him, the Spirit is the norm of the Christian life. He does not depict the believer as an automaton dragged along by the Spirit. On the contrary, Paul admonishes believers that if they are in the Spirit they have a responsibility to live lives which are in accordance with the nature of the Spirit. He frequently urges them "to walk according to the Spirit." Although Paul never identifies absolutely the 'walk according to the Spirit' with the 'law of love' or the 'law of Christ,' there are numerous texts which show the close relationship and make it clear that, for him, all three express the ethical imperative of the Christian life.

In chapter four an attempt was made to show that Paul conceived of himself as a prophet. In his letters he draws parallels between himself and the Old Testament prophets in regard to his call, his visions, his role as a servant and spokesman of God. He also calls attention to his suffering as a result of his belief and work. Scholars have pointed out these parallels in supporting their arguments for Paul's strong sense of apostleship. Paul's letters indicate another reason for selecting prophetic terms for describing and making claims for his apostleship. If it can be assumed that he adopted the view reflected in the Intertestamental Literature, i.e., that the prophetic function involved interpretation of the law, his purpose in describing his apostleship in prophetic terms becomes

clear. He had a special call to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, and his proclamation necessitated a new understanding of the law. Most likely Paul called attention to his prophetic attributes and qualifications in describing his apostolic role because the interpretation of the law was considered one of the major tasks of the prophet in the eschatological age.

It is not enough just to state the all inclusive norm of the Christian life. If it is to have meaning for particular situations the general principle must be set forth in concrete and immediate terms. In chapter five it was argued that, for Paul, this was the task of the Christian prophet. An attempt was made to show that Paul purposefully placed his only extensive statement on prophecy immediately after his long discourse on love. The exegesis of I Cor. 13 and 14 revealed that the way of the Christian life is love, and it is the responsibility of the Christian prophet to determine, after careful, sober judgment, what this means for the congregation as it is confronted with ethical problems. The prophet speaks to the gathered community, the community gathered for worship, and spells out in concrete terms what it means to live the Christian life. The congregation assumes its prophetic responsibility by weighing carefully the words of the individual prophets and by making decisions and acting for the edification of the community. Paul's writings indicate that he fulfilled his prophetic task in this regard. His letters include sections of exhortation which give specific directions for ethical action.

Although the ethical aspect of prophecy has been emphasized in this study, it must not be assumed that this excludes other possibilities as functions of prophecy in the Pauline and other New Testament writings. In chapter four Paul's reference to his vision, an experience he shared with the Old Testament prophets, was noted. I Cor. 14:21-25 indicates that one of the results of true prophetic activity is conversion. The point is that Paul, although he recognized that prophecy had more than one way of manifesting itself, stressed the ethical aspect. It was crucial for the edification of the church.

This study raises many questions in regard to the work of Christian prophets as understood by other New Testament writers. Scholars have noted the importance of the early Christian prophets. In a discussion about Form Criticism and the transmission of oral tradition Wilder points to "the strong possibility that the earliest years of the primitive community were dominated by the Christian prophets and by charismatic authority. . . ."[1] Unfortunately Wilder does not explore this possibility. Bultmann attributes the prophetic and apocalyptic sayings of Jesus to Christian prophets.[2] Fuller, discussing the four main strata of Synoptic Gospels which the form critics have proposed, asserts that one of the layers is partially the

---

[1]Amos Wilder, "Form-History and the Oldest Tradition," Neotestamentica et Patristica, ed. W. C. vanUnnik and others (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), p. 5.

[2]Rudolf Bultmann, The History of Synoptic Tradition, tr. John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 108-130.

work of Christian prophets.[1] No attempt is made by these men to justify or substantiate these statements. No discussion about the concept of Christian prophecy is included. However, the idea needs to be considered.

If our thesis is correct perhaps the work of the Christian prophet could be arrived at through a study of the exhortation sayings, particularly the relationship between the paranetic statements of Paul and those found in the Synoptics. Dibelius has given the name 'Christian exhortations' to one of the types or forms of the material which make up the Synoptic gospels. In his discussion of the material he deals with the Pauline hortatory sections. He asserts that he observes a distinct difference in this material from that of other Pauline writings. He writes: ". . . they lack an immediate relation with the circumstances of the letter. The rules and directions are not formulated for special churches and concrete cases, but for the general requirements of earliest Christendom."[2] For Dibelius, these belong to tradition; they represent the fundamentals of the new Christian life which were taught to new converts. The form of such directions were revised and extended in the church. Dibelius overstates his case in denying the relationship of hortatory statements with the other sections of the letter. I

---

[1]Reginald H. Fuller, The New Testament in Current Study (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), pp. 70-71.

[2]Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, tr. Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 239.

Corinthians is an example of Paul's speaking to the immediate situation and problems confronting the congregation.

Paul apparently makes use of the sayings of Jesus but adds his own authoritative word. It is significant that in matters of ethics, or, if our thesis is correct, when Paul speaks prophetically, he holds his own word to be as authoritative as that of Jesus. Is it possible that, because he spoke as a prophet in regard to ethical decisions, he commanded this kind of authority? Can some connection between the prophetic ethical word of Paul and the exhortatory statements of the Synoptics be made? James M. Robinson, recognizing the similarity between I Corinthians and the Q material of the Synoptics, has suggested the possibility that Paul's letter reflects debate over the correct interpretation of the sayings of Jesus for specific historical situations.[1] Whether he is correct or not cannot be discussed here. The point is that it seems entirely possible that the work of the prophets, which the form critics feel was important in the early church, lay in the area of ethics.[2]

Although the writer of Acts is concerned withoother aspects of prophecy, e.g., prediction of future events (Acts

---

[1]James M. Robinson, "Kerygma and History in the New Testament," The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (New York: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 114-150.

[2]The implications of this idea for the greater problem of the relationship between Paul and the historical Jesus was mentioned in chapter three.

11:28), designation of a specific person or persons for a particular office or task (Acts 13:1-3), he also included one instance in which prophets exhorted the brethren with many words (15:32).

The understanding of prophet and prophecy as primarily embracing an ethical function would strengthen the position of those scholars who interpret Revelation, not futuristically, but as a work written to exhort and strengthen the Christian congregations as they faced persecution by the Roman government. The author, who explicitly states that he is a prophet, is not so much predicting future events as he is admonishing Christians how they should conduct themselves in the face of hardships which are inevitable.

The idea of an ethical emphasis in prophecy also should give pause to those who have tended to see the prophetic function as primarily predictive or concerned with apocalyptic vision. The two are not mutually exclusive. As we noted, visions and ethical pronouncements were characteristic of the Old Testament prophets. The Synoptic Gospels reveal that the teachings of Jesus included both aspects. Matthew, in particular, emphasizes instruction and exhortation for the church, but he also directs this ethical teaching toward the end expectation, "heightening," as Bacon points out, "the apocalyptic judgment scenes."[1] Paul, although ethical action apparently is his

---

[1]B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1930), p 432; cf. Gunther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and H. J. Held, Tradition and Interpretation, trans. Percy Scott (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963, pp. 15-24 in which Bornkamm gives a short analysis of Matthew, showing the close link between the instruction to the church and the end expectation.

major concern, also includes references to visionary experiences.

By pointing to the importance of ethics in Paul's letters, this study raises questions for the view of those who have stressed Paul's concept of justification by faith and have excluded, ignored, or failed to take seriously the Apostle's statements about the believer's responsibility to lead a life worthy of his status as a new creation.[1] It must be recognized that the positions of Paul and James are not poles apart. Jeremias is correct in asserting that they are refuting two different, almost opposite, problems and must necessarily assume different positions.[2] To deny that Paul was deeply concerned for Christian works and moral responsibility denotes a failure to deal with a crucial part of his writings. It was the Apostle who issued judgment on an unrepentent member, handed down decisions regarding ethical action, and included a list of exhortations at the end of most of his letters.

This study makes it clear that Paul thought of ethical action in terms of the community, and not only in terms of the individual. As we saw Paul did not believe that man in the Spirit, the believer, needed no rules and simply knew and did the will of God. There is a certain spontaneity of life in the Spirit, but it is impossible to explain away the specific

---

[1]Cf. Edgar J. Goodspeed, "Justification," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII (1954), 86-91

[2]Joachim Jeremias, "Paul and James," Expository Times, LXIV (1954-55), 368-371.

demands in his letters. For Paul, the Christian did not automatically know what the law of love meant for every situation. It was the work of the prophet to interpret. It must also be stressed that the Christian community as a whole participated in this responsibility. An individual was not entirely free to act as he felt led by the Spirit. The pronouncement of the individual prophets in the public worship service was submitted to the careful and sober judgment of the entire congregation. For Paul, the individual Christian was not 'on his own' in regard to ethics. He was responsible to the community, to the Body of Christ. It should also be noted that, although Paul was speaking 'in the Spirit,' he was not without guidelines, i.e., the Old Testament and the sayings of Jesus. His task was to interpret these in relations to the demand in his own day, in relation to concrete situations.

If the task of the prophet can be described as primarily ethical, the question arises as to what was the task of the apostle and teacher as far as Paul is concerned. What was the relationship of the prophet to the other two? The exegesis of I Cor. 14 indicated that performing the prophetic task did not necessitate an order or office. No doubt some members of the congregation articulated the prophetic word more clearly and more often than others and became known as 'the prophets,' but the prophetic task remained on the shoulders of the entire congregation. There is no indication that 'the prophets' held an office and occupied themselves with prophecy all the time.

The point is that when they prophesied they were primarily concerned with ethical action. In the same way it is possible that the apostolic function was primarily concerned with preaching (κήρυγμα) the gospel and the teaching function primarily with teaching (διδαχή) what the Christian faith involved. There is no reason to believe that these functions are mutually exclusive or that each is performed by only a well-defined group. All these ministries may be performed by one person. If a man prophesies he may also teach and vice versa.

It was pointed out in the first chapter that various scholars have dealt with the problem as to why prophecy died out when the church became institutionalized. The idea is expressed that when the charismatically gifted men disappeared elected officers took their place. Apparently office, or order, and the Spirit, the giver of the charismatic gifts, are considered as exclusive of each other. For example, Streeter writes: "To the prophetic type of mind, system, whether in thought or organization, is normally uncongenial."[1] Throughout Schweizer's book on church order, there is a tendency to divorce the developing institutional church from the Holy Spirit. He writes: "But with the threat of an institutional Church, in which a monarchical bishop wanted to rule everything, the self-sufficiency of the Church as it stood under the living

---

[1]B. H. Streeter, The Primitive Church (New York: Macmillan Co., 1929), p. 70.

activity of the Holy Spirit had to be stressed; . . ."[1] He also associates closely the prophet and the Holy Spirit, describing the prophet as "a Church member called by the Spirit."[2] The question must be asked: Does the emergence of the institutional church necessitate the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit and the prophets? Surely it is possible for the Holy Spirit to work in the midst of order. According to at least two New Testament passages the Holy Spirit and prophets were active in the ordering of the church. In Acts 13:1-3 Barnabas and Saul were set aside for missionary work on instructions of the Holy Spirit acting through the prophets and teachers. Timothy was appointed to his church office by the inspired prophets (I Tim. 1:18). This study indicates that, according to the letters of Paul, there was no order of prophets, prophecy was the responsibility of the community. Why is it necessary to assume that the Holy Spirit withdrew and prophecy ceased? The creation of elective offices does not preclude prophetic activity nor make it superfluous. This function, performed by the elected officers or not, remains the responsibility of the entire congregation, individually, and as a whole.

---

[1]Eduard Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament, trans. Frank Clarke (London: S. C. M. Press, 1961), p. 168.

[2]Ibid., p. 50.

The questions raised in this last chapter take us beyond the limits set for this dissertation. Their implications may be the basis of another study. If our thesis is correct the investigation of these and other questions related to prophecy should take into consideration the ethical aspect of the prophetic function.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Abelson, J. The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature. London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1912.

Abrahams, I. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels. Vol. I. Cambridge: University Press, 1924.

Allo, E. B. Premiere Epitre Aux Corinthiens. Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1935.

The Babylonian Talmud. Translated under editorship of I. Epstein. London: Soncino Press, 1948.

Bacon, B. W. Studies in Matthew. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1930.

Barth, Karl. Church Dogmatics. Vol. IV, pt. 2. Translated by G.W. Bromiley. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1958.

_____. The Resurrection of the Dead. Translated by H. J. Stenning. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1933.

Bauer, Walter; Arndt, William F.; and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Beardslee, William A. Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul. London: S. C. M. Press, 1961.

Best, Ernest. One Body in Christ. London: S. P. C. K. Press, 1955.

Bicknell, Edward John. The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians of Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1932.

Black, Matthew. The Scrolls and Christian Origins. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.

Bonnard, Pierre. Jesus-Christ Edifiant son Eglise. Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, S. A., 1948.

Bonsirven, Joseph. Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ. Translated by William Wolf. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Bornkamm, Gunther; Barth, Gerhard; and Held, H. J. Tradition and Interpretation. Translated by Percy Scott. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

Bousset, Wilhelm. Die Religion des Jedentums im Neutestamenlichen Zeitalter. 2nd ed. Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1906.

Bouttier, Michel. Christianity According to Paul. Translated by Frank Clark. London: S. C. M. Press, 1966.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

Bring, Ragnar. Commentary on Galatians. Translated by Eric Wahlstrom. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961.

Brownlee, William H. The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Bruce, F. F. Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Erdmans, 1959.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John March. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

_____. Primitive Christianity. Translated by Reginald Fuller. New York: World Publishing Co., 1956.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. Vol. I. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Burton, Ernest D. A Critical Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians of International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921.

Calvin, John. Commentaries of the Epistles of Paul to Galatians and Ephesians. Translated by William Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1954.

_____. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Translated by John W. Fraser, edited by David W. & Thomas F. Torrance, Calvin's Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1960.

Campenhausen, Hans Freiherr von. Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953.

Case, Shirley Jackson. The Evolution of Early Christianity. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914.

Cullman, Oscar. Christ and Time. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950.

_____. The Christology of the New Testament. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

_____. Le Culte dans l'Eglise Primitive. Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, S. A., 1944.

_____. Early Christian Worship. Translated by A. Stewart Todd & James B. Torrance. London: S. C. M. Press, 1953.

Dahl, Nils A. Das Volk Gottes. 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.

Dancy, J. C. A Commentary on I Maccabees. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954.

Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: S. P. C. K., 1948.

_____. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge: University Press, 1964.

_____. The Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.

Deissmann, Adolf. Light from the Ancient East. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. 2 ed. rev. New York: George H. Doran, Co., 1927.

Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Dobschutz, Ernst von. Christian Life in the Primitive Church. Translated by George Bremner, edited by W. D. Morrison. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.

Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. New York: Harper & Bros., 1960.

_____. History and Gospel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938.

Duncan, George S. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians of Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Harper & Bros., 1934.

Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Translated by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

Elleger, Karl. Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten-Meer. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohn (Paul Siebeck), 1953.

Enslin, Morton Scott. The Ethics of Paul. New York: Harper & Bros., 1930.

Fairweather, W., and Black, J. Sutherland. First Book of Maccabees. Vol. 54 of Cambridge Bible for Schools & Colleges. Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. Cambridge: University Press, 1895.

Fascher, Erich. Prophētes: eine sprach- und religions-geschichtliche Untersuchung. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1927.

Feine, Paul, and Behm, Johannes. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. 14th rev. ed. Revised and edited by Werner Georg Kümmel. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Filson, Floyd V. St. Paul's Conception of Recompense. Leipzig: J. D. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1931.

Frame, James Everett. Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessaolonians of International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

Fridrichsen, Anton. The Apostle and His Message. Uppsala: Almquest & Wiksell, 1947.

Fuller, Reginald H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

_____. The New Testament in Current Study. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.

Gaster, Theodor. The Dead Sea Scriptures. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1956.

Gaster, Moses. The Samaritans. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Gerhardsson, Birger. Memory and Manuscript. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961.

Grosheide, F. W. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians of New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1960.

Guignebert, Charles. The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus. New Hyde Park: University Books, 1959.

Guy, Harold A. New Testament Prophecy, Its Origin and Significance. London: The Epworth Press, 1947.

Hamilton, Neill Q. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd Ltd., 1957.

Harnack, Adolf. The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Translated by James Moffatt. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1908.

Herford, R. Travers. The Pharisees. Boston: Beacon Press, 1962.

Hering, Jean. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. Translated from second edition by A. W. Heathcote & P. J. Allcock. London: Epworth Press, 1962.

_____. La Seconde Epitre de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens. Paris: Delachaux & Niestle' S. A., 1958.

Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952.

Hoyle, R. Birch. The Holy Spirit in St. Paul. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927.

Hunter, A. M. Paul and His Predecessors. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

Hurd, John C. The Origin of I Corinthians. New York: Seabury Press, 1965.

Jeremias, Joachim. The Central Message of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Josephus, Flavius. Josephus, Vol. I-IX. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-43.

Klausner, Joseph. The Messianic Idea in Israel. Translated by W. F. Stinespring. New York: MacMillan Co., 1955.

Knox, John. Chapters in the Life of Paul. New York: Abingdon Press, 1950.

Kosmala, Hans. Hebraer-Essener-Christen. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

Kragerud, Alv. Der Lieblings Jünger im Johannesevangelium. Oslo: Osloer Universitätsverlag, 1959.

Lietzmann, D. Hans. An die Korinther I/II. 4th ed., sup. by Kümmel. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1949.

Lindars, Barnabas. New Testament Apologetic. London: S. C. M. Press, 1961.

Lindbloom, J. Prophecy in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1962.

MacDonald, John. The Theology of the Samaritans. London: S. C. M. Press, 1964.

Manson, T. W. The Church's Ministry. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1948.

The Midrash on Psalms. Translated by William G. Braude. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Midrash Rabbah. Vol. I-X. Translated and edited by H. Freedman. London: Soncino Press, 1939.

The Mishnah. Translated by Herbert Danby. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Mitton, C. L. The Epistle of Ephesians. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Moffatt, James. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians of Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Harper & Bros., 1938.

Montague, George T. Growth in Christ. Kirkwood, Mo.: Maryhurst Press, 1960.

Montgomery, J. A. The Samaritans. Philadelphia: John C. Winston Co., 1907.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era the Age of the Tannaim. Vol. I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Munck, Johannes. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. Translated by Frank Clark. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

Nestle, Eberhard, and Erwin Nestle, eds. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25 Auflage, Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

Nygren, Anders. Agape and Eros. Translated by Philip S. Watson. London: S. P. C. K., 1953.

Philo Judaeus. Philo. Vol. I-X. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930-32.

Plato. The Dialogues of Plato. Vol. I. Translated by B. Jowett. New York: Random House, 1937.

_____. Timaeus. Vol. VII. Translated by R. G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Rabin, Chaim. The Zadokite Documents. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Rad, Gerhard von. Old Testament Theology. Vol. I. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Rengstorf, Karl Heinrech. Apostleship. Translated by J. R. Coates. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit. London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1928.

_____. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

_____. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Robinson, James M. A New Quest of the Historical Jesus. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1959.

Robinson, John A. T. The Body. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1957.

Rowley, H. H. The Rediscovery of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.

Russell, D. S. Between the Testaments. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960.

_____. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Sanday, W., and Headlam, A. C. The Epistle to the Romans of International Critical Commentary. 2nd ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. The Moral Teaching of the New Testament. Translated J. Holland-Smith and W. J. O'Hara. New York: Herder & Herder, 1965.

Schoeps, Hans Joachim. Paul; the Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Butterworth Press, 1961.

Schrage, Wolfgang. Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese. Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1961.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Translated by William Montgomery. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1931.

Schweizer, Eduard. Church Order in the New Testament. Translated by Frank Clark. London: S. C. M. Press, 1961.

_____. Spirit of God. Translated by A. W. Harvey. London: A. C. Black, Ltd., 1960.

Scott, R. B. Y. The Relevance of the Prophets. New York: MacMillan Co., 1957.

Selby, Donald J. Toward the Understanding of St. Paul. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

Selwyn, E. C. The Christian Prophets and the Prophetic Apocalypse. London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1900.

Shürer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. Div. II, Vol. I. Translated by John McPherson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890.

Spicq, Caslaus. Agape in the New Testament. Vol. II. Translated by Sister Marie Acquainas McNamara & Sister Mary Honoria Richter. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1965.

Stendahl, Krister. The School of Matthew. Uppsala, 1954.

Strack, Hermann L., and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. Vol. I-IV. Munchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.

Streeter, B. H. The Primitive Church. New York: MacMillan Co., 1929.

Tannehill, Robert C. Dying and Rising with Christ. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.

Targum of Isiah. Translated and edited by John F. Stenning. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Teeple, Howard M. The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957.

Vermes, Geza. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1962.

_____. Discovery in the Judean Desert. New York: Desclee Co., 1956.

Vielhauer, Philipp. Oikodome. Karlsruhe-Deirbach: Verlagsdruckerei Gebr.-Tron., 1940.

Volz, Paul. Der Geist Gottes. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1910.

Wahlstrom, Eric. The New Life in Christ. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950.

Weiss, D. Johannes. Der erste Korintherbrief. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

Whiteley, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

Windisch, Hans. Der zweite Korintherbrief. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924.

_____. Paulus und Christus. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1934.

Wolfson, Harry A. Philo. Vol. II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Wotherspoon, H. J. The Ministry in the Church. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1916.

Articles in Collections

Bonnard, Pierre. "L'Epitre de Saint Paul aux Galates." Commentaire du Noveau Testament, Vol. IX. Paris: Delachaux & Niestle' S. A., 1953.

Bright, John. "Isaiah-I." Peake's Commentary of the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., 1962.

Craig, Clarence T. "The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Introduction and Exegesis." The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. X. Edited by George A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.

Dodd, C. H. "The Mind of Paul I" and "The Mind of Paul II." New Testament Studies. Manchester: University Press, 1953.

Filson, Floyd V. "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Introduction and Exegesis." The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. X. Edited by George A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.

Findlay, G. G. "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians." The Expositor's Greek Testament. Vol. II. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., n.d.

Giblet, J. "Le Messinanisme Prophetique." L'Attente Du Messie, Edited by L. Cerfaux and others. Louvain: Desclee De Brouwer, 1954.

Neil, William. "I & II Thessalonians." Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., 1962.

Robinson, James M. "Kerygma and History in the New Testament." The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Edited by J. Philip Hyatt. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Sanders, J. N. "Galatians." Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., 1962.

Scott, C. A. A. "What Happened at Pentecost." The Spirit. Edited by B. H. Streeter. New York: MacMillan Co., 1919.

Smith, Morton. "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century." Israel. Edited by Moshe Davis. New York: Harper & Bros., 1956.

Stamm, Raymond T. "The Epistle to the Galatians." Introduction and Exegesis." Interpreter's Bible. Vol. X. Edited by George A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.

Vos, Geerhardus. "The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit." Biblical and Theological Studies. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

Wendland, Heinz-Dietrich. "Die Briefe an die Korinther." Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Vol. II. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1938.

Wilder, Amos. "Form History and the Oldest Tradition." Neotestamentica et Patristica. Edited by W. C. van Unnik and others. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962.

Articles in Dictionaries, Encyclopedias and Periodicals

Ahern, Barnabas. "The Indwelling Spirit, Pledge of Our Inheritance (Eph. 1:14)." Catholic Biblical Quarterly, IX, (1947), 179-189.

Barrett, C. K. "Christianity at Corinth." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XLVI (1964), 269-297.

Barth, Markus. "A Chapter on the Church--the Body of Christ." Interpretation, XII (1958), 131-156.

Batey, Richard. "Paul's Bride Image." Interpretation, XVII (1963), 176-182.

Beare, Frank W. "The Ministry in the New Testament Church." Anglican Theological Review, XXXVII (1955), 3-19.

Beker, J. Christian. "Aspects of the Holy Spirit in Paul." Union Seminary Quarterly Review, XIV (1958), 3-16.

Beker, Johan C. "The Pastoral Letters." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 668-675.

Bland, Sheldon. "The Death of Zechariah in Rabbinic Literature." Hebrew Union College Annual, XII-XIII (1937-38), 327-346.

Brownlee, William H. "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Biblical Archeologist, XIV (1951), 54-76.

_____. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline." Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies, nos. 10-12 (1951).

Bornkamm, G. "Faith and Reason in Paul's Epistles," New Testament Studies, IV (1957-58), 93-100.

Brown, Raymond. "The Messianism of Qumran." Catholic Biblical Review, XIX (1957), 53-82.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Karl Barth, 'Die Auferstehung der Toten'," Glauben Und Verstehen, Vol. I. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933.

Burnier, J. "The Way." A Companion to the Bible. Edited by J. J. vonAllmen. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Burrows, Millar. "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." Anglican Theological Review, XXXIV (1934), 202-206.

Cowley, A. "The Samaritan Doctrine of the Messiah." The Expositor, fifth series, I (1895), 161-174.

Cross, Frank M., Jr. "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah." Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XII (1953), 274-277.

Davidson, A. D. "Prophecy and Prophets." A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings, IV (1902), 106-127.

Davidson, William L. "Dualism (Greek)." Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings, V (1921), 107-111.

Davies, W. D. "Ethics in the New Testament." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, II (1962), 167-176.

_____. "Law in First-Century Judaism." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 89-95.

Dentan, R. C. "Mind." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 383-384.

Evans, O.E. "Kingdom of God." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 17-26.

Fischel, H. A. "Martyr and Prophet." Jewish Quarterly Review, XXXVII (1946-47), 265-280.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Elijah." Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer, V (1902), 121-127.

Glatzer, Nahum N. "Talmudic Interpretation of Prophecy." Review of Religion, X (1946), 115-137.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. "Justification." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII (1954), 86-91.

Greeven, D. H. "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus." Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIV (1952), 1-43.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Paul and James." Expository Times, LXIV (1954-55), 368-371.

Johansson, Nils. "I Cor. 13 & I Cor. 14." New Testament Studies, X (1963-64), 383-392.

Kingsbury, Edwin C. "The Prophets and the Council of Yahweh." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1964), 279-286.

Knox, John. "Rom. 15:14-33 and Paul's Apostolic Mission." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1964), 1-11.

Lampe, G. W. H. "Holy Spirit." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, II (1962), 626-639.

Lanchester, H. C. O. "The Sibylline Oracles." The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Lowe, John. "An Examination of Attempts to Detect Developments in St. Paul's Theology." Journal of Theological Studies, XLII (1941), 129-142.

McCaughey, J. D. "Question of the Historical Jesus." The Reformed Theological Review, XX (1961), 1-12.

Manson, T. W. "The Message of the Epistles--I Corinthians," Expository Times, XLIV (1932-33), 500-504.

Mendelsohn, S. "Bet Hillel and Bet Shammai." Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by Isidore Singer, III (1902), 115-116.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. "ὁδός," Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. 2nd ed. rev., Edited by G. Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, V (1954), 42-118.

Mitchell, E. K. "Prophecy." Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings, X (1921), 381-384.

Moe, Olaf. "Vernunft und Geist in Neuen Testament." Zeitschrift fur Systematische Theologie, XI (1933-34), 351-390.

Myers, Jacob M., and Freed, Edwin D. "Is Paul Among the Prophets." Interpretation, XX (1966), 40-53.

Napier, B. D. "Prophet, Prophetism." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, III (1962), 896-919.

Porteous, Norman W. "Ritual and Righteousness." Interpretation, III (1949), 400-414.

Preiss, Theo. "The Inner Witness of the Holy Spirit." Translated by Donald G. Miller. Interpretation, VII (1953), 259-280.

Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. "δοῦλος." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated & edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, edited by Gerhard Kittel, III (1965), 246-265.

Rist, Martin. "Apocalyptism." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, I (1962), 157-161.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. "The Council of Yahweh," Journal of Theological Studies, XLV (1944), 151-157.

Sass, Gerhard. "Zur Bedeuting von δοῦλος bei Paulus." Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XL (1941), 24-32.

Schmauck, Werner. "Das prophetische Amt in der Gemeinde." Junge Kirche, XIX (1958), 126-131.

Schmidt, K. L. "κλάδέω." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed. Gerhard Kittel, III (1965), 487-496.

Schweizer, Eduard. "The Service of Worship," Interpretation, XIII (1959), 400-408.

Scott, Hugh M. "Place of οἰκοδομέω in New Testament Worship." Princeton Theological Review, II (1904), 402-424.

Scott, R. B. Y. "The Expectation of Elijah." The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought, III (1926), 490-502.

Silberman, Lou. H. "The Two 'Messiahs' of the Manual of Discipline." Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 77-82.

_____. "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Commentary (1 Qp Hab.)." Revue de Qumran, III (1961-62), 321-364.

Smith, Morton. "Pauline Problems." Harvard Theological Review, L (1957), 107-131.

Stagg, Frank. "The Motif of First Corinthians." Southwestern Journal of Theology, III (1960), 15-24.

Stoessel, Horace E. "Notes on Romans 12:1-2." Interpretation, XVII (1963), 161-175.

Sweet, J. P. M. "A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossalalia." New Testament Studies, XIII (1967), 240-257.

Titus, Eric L. "Did Paul Write I Cor. 13?" Journal of Bible and Religion, XXVII (1959), 299-302.

Vogelstein, Hermann. "The Development of the Apostolate in Judaism and its Transformation in Christianity." Hebrew Union College Annual, II (1925), 99-123.

Wieder, N. "The Law-Interpreter of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Second Moses." Journal of Jewish Studies, IV (1953), 158-175.

Young, Franklin W. "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-Examination." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 285-299.

Unpublished Works

Beker, Johan C. "Prophecy and the Spirit in the Apostolic Fathers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1955.

Bowlin, Ruth Elizabeth. "The Christian Prophets in the New Testament." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1958.

Bronznick, Norman Meyer. "Rabbinic Views of Prophecy." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1965.

Craine, Charles E. "The Significance of Paul's Teaching on the Holy Spirit for the Christian View of Man." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey, 1951.

Crane, Sidney D. "The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1962.

Winn, Albert Curry. "Pneuma and Kerygma: A New Approach to the New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, 1956.

ABSTRACT

PROPHECY IN THE WRITINGS OF PAUL

New Testament scholars have given little attention to the concept of prophecy in the writings of Paul. This study was undertaken because of the significant role which prophecy played in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Literature, and the New Testament and because of the centrality of Paul as a figure in early Christianity. Its purpose is to investigate what the function of prophecy is in the thinking of Paul and to ascertain what, for him, was the particular contribution made by the prophet to the primitive church.

The first chapter includes a statement of the problem, a brief survey of scholarship related to the problem, and a preview of the entire study.

The second chapter is a consideration of the concept of prophecy in the background of Pauline thought, i.e., the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature. Although the belief that prophecy had ceased was prevalent in Jewish thought prior to the time of Jesus, there was also the fervent hope for its return as well as for a prophet who would come in the eschatological age. No attempt is made to identify the expected prophet but simply to ascertain the role he would assume. Ideas varied a great deal, but the concept of the eschatological prophet as a lawgiver or interpreter of the law was one of the major forms

of belief in regard to his task. The Old Testament, Rabbinic Literature, Apocrypha, Samaritan writings, and the Dead Sea Scrolls reflect the expectation of a prophet who would come in the new age and make final, definitive decisions regarding the law.

The third chapter is devoted to a study of Paul's understanding of the Holy Spirit, a concept closely associated with prophecy in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Literature, and New Testament. An attempt was made to show that Paul considered the Spirit the norm of the Christian life, not in the sense that the believer becomes an automaton dragged along by the Spirit. On the contrary, Paul admonishes believers that they have a responsibility to live lives which are in accordance with the nature of the Spirit, the power of the final age. Although Paul never identifies absolutely the 'walk according to the Spirit' with the law of love or the law of Christ, there are numerous texts which show their close relationship and make it clear that, for him, all three express the ethical imperative of the Christian life.

In the fourth chapter it is argued that Paul selected prophetic terms and attributes in describing his apostolic role for a specific purpose. There is general agreement that Paul believed he had a special call to preach to the gentiles and proclaim that faith, not circumcision, was essential for salvation. His proclamation necessitated a new understanding of the law. Most likely, Paul used prophetic terms for expressing his

apostolic task, because he shared the view of the intertestamental writers that the prophetic function involved interpretation of the law.

Chapter five presents an exegetical study of I Cor. 14, Paul's only extensive statement regarding prophecy, with special reference to its context and relationship to chapters 12 and 13 and an analysis of the words related to prophecy. Apparently the Apostle purposefully placed his treatment of prophecy immediately after his discussion of love, because, for him, love is the law of the Christian life, and the prophet the interpreter of that law. As interpreter of the law of love, the prophet is to speak to the gathered community, the community gathered for worship, and spell out in concrete terms what it means to live the Christian life in particular situations.

The study concludes by pointing to implications and questions raised by this dissertation for other areas of New Testament study.

Mary Faith Carson

August, 1967